A Seasonable Warneing To the Poor persecuted Church Of COTLAND,

OR

Dissuasive to all true Non-Conmists, from sinful complying with, eing of, and active submitting to abjured Pre-, and their Underlings, by hearing of them, any other way strengthening their hands to the overturning the Work of Reformation.

By PHILALETHES.

---

n. 10. Vers. 1. *Verily, verily I say unto you, He that treth not by the door into the Sheepfold, but climbeth up me other way, the same is a Thief and a Robber.*

th. 7. Vers. 15. *Beware of false Prophets, which come you in sheeps cloathing, but inwardly they are ravening Wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits.*

Printed in the Year 1682.

Ane Inquirie into the Caſe now ſo common Whether it be lawful to hear the Prelats and their Curats? Or, which is aſl one, whether it be lawful for the Lords People in Scotland to ſubmit to the pretended Eccleſiaſtick Authoritie of Prelats and their Curats and to receive from them the Ordinances of God pretended to be in their hands.

FOR clearing up the ſtate of the Queſtion and making way for thedeterminationthereof, it will be needfull in the firſt place to open up a little the terms in which it is conceived. The terms which here are to be explained, we ſumm them up in theſe three: *Firſt*, Prelats and their Curats. *Secondly*, Hearing or ſubmitting and receiving the ordinances of God from them. *Thirdly*, Lawfull or not. The I. Belongs to the Subject of the queſtion *in obliquo*. The II. Is its ſubject *in recto*. The III. Is the attribut of the queſtion *in recto*. To which is added *in obliquo*, the Lords People in Scotland which term needs no explication. As to the firſt, we are to inquire what is meant by *Prelats*.. Secondly what is meant by *Curats*. As for Prelats firſt if you beleeve the lyes, diſſimulations and prevarications of Prelatiſts, it

will be hard to know what they are: But the shifting and unconstancie of expression in this point, if we will inquire what they are by divine right, they are just nothing, no ground at all for them in the Word of God, under what shape soever they introduce themselves; or whatsoever mask they put on for that purpose: Yea, on the contrary, the Word of God doth clearly condemn them. If we inquire, what they are by Jurisdiction, : That is to be seen in the lawes and acts instituting & constituting them, we mean acts Civil or Parliamentary; for there is no Ecclesiastick act or canon for them: Yea and more, all our Church Judicatories are yet standing in force againſt them unrepealed by any Church power whatsoever; yea albeit there were such acts and canons for them, yet that were not enough to make their authority lawful or valid, seeing Christ hes given no such power to the Church, as to make acts of that nature; so that they are not only a meer human creature but which is worse, a meer hvmane and political devyce deryving their whole power and being from the civil power and civil Magistrat, and pretending to make a new species or kynd of officers over the House of God. Thirdly, if we ask for them in their practise, that is not only heard of, but sadly felt and sadly seen. Fourthly, If we ask for them in their patrons and exemplaries, that is the English Prelates whose vile image they are, albeit sometime they intimat some thing to the contrary. In a word, whether we consider their titles and dignities and usurped power over the Church, manner of government and way of Church discipline, exercised as it is, both the one and the other (for kynd and quality) they are all one with the Prelats of the Romish Church, as is clearly demonstrat by *Didoclavius*. Only with this exception, that the English and ours doe not expresly acknowledge the Pope; but puts the Supreme Magistrat in his place: And as in the Papacy some holds them to be of divine right; others, that all their power is from the Pope, so some

ane of ours mutters for a divine right, others derive from the King: whence either they make him ane Eccleſiaſtick perſon as well as a Civil, or elſe denyes all government of the Church diſtinct from that of the Civil Magiſtrat, which clearly dethrones Chriſt, and gives him no viſible Kingdome or power or government in his Church: Now this manner of government and power (common to the Poiſh Prelats and ours) is firſt *Lordly* forbidden, 1. *Pet.* 5. 3. Secondly, *Worldly* and *political* diſcharged, *Math.* 20. 25, 26, 27. Thirdly, *Antichriſtian* and *tyrannical* over the ſouls of the Lords People; ſett out by that Beaſt with the ſeven heads and ten horns, *Revel.* 13. For as the ten horned Beaſt holds forth the Pope and his Prelats as falſe Prophets, and the ſcarlet whore a vile adulterous Church, *Revel.* 17. ſo that firſt holds forth their Lordly, worldly politick, tyrannical, antichriſtian forme of government; all one with that of our Prelats inconſiſtent with, contradictory unto and everſive of the government inſtituted by Chriſt in his Church; which as it is in its own nature ſpiritual, ſo (as it is exerciſed under Chriſt) it is only a miniſterial power and declaratory of his will.

We inquire next what is meant by Curats or Prelats Miniſters. If you call them ſo. Theſe Curats are of three ſorts. The firſt are theſe who being admitted before the year 1649. have either by word or practiſe [or both] yeelded up into the Prelats hands that power which they had immediatly from Chriſt by the Presbyter to govern in the houſe of God with others; or to ſend forth new labourers to Chriſts vineyard, as need requires; or to adminiſtrat the publick worſhip in ane immediat dependance on him: In a word they have taken the keyes of the Houſe of God, and treacherouſly given them to the hands of the Antichriſtian Prelat; and hes quit with their charter from Chriſt and taken a new charter from the Prelats; all which is evident by their practical ſubmiſſion according to Law.

will be hard to know what they are: But the shifting and unconstancie of expression in this point, if we will inquire what they are by divine right, they are just nothing, no ground at all for them in the Word of God, under what shape soever they introduce themselves; or whatsoever mask they put on for that purpose: Yea, on the contrary, the Word of God doth clearly condemn them. If we inquire, what they are by Jurisdiction,: That is to be seen in the lawes and acts instituting & constituting them, we mean acts Civil or Parliamentary; for there is no Ecclesiastick act or canon for them: Yea and more, all our Church Judicatories are yet standing in force against them unrepealed by any Church power whatsoever; yea albeit there were such acts and canons for them, yet that were not enough to make their authority lawful or valid, seeing Christ hes given no such power to the Church, as to make acts of that nature; so that they are not only a meer human creature but which is worse, a meer hvmane and political devyce deryving their whole power and being from the civil power and civil Magistrat, and pretending to make a new species or kynd of officers over the House of God. Thirdly, if we ask for them in their practise, that is not only heard of, but sadly felt and sadly seen. Fourthly, If we ask for them in their patrons and exemplaries, that is the English Prelates whose vile image they are, albeit sometime they intimat some thing to the contrary. In a word, whether we consider their titles and dignities and usurped power over the Church, manner of government and way of Church discipline, exercised as it is, both the one and the other (for kynd and quality) they are all one with the Prelats of the Romish Church, as is clearly demonstrat by *Didoclavius*. Only with this exception, that the English and ours doe not expresly acknowledge the Pope; but puts the Supreme Magistrat in his place: And as in the Papacy some holds them to be of divine right; others, that all their power is from the Pope, so some

ne of ours mutters for a divine right, others derive from
e King: whence either they make him ane Eccleſiaſtick
erſon as well as a Civil, or elſe denyes all government of
e Church diſtinct from that of the Civil Magiſtrat, which
dearly deth rones Chriſt, and gives him no viſible King-
ome or power or government in his Church: Now this
anner of government and power (common to the Po-
iſh Prelats and ours) is firſt *Lordly* forbidden, 1. *Pet.* 5. 3.
econdly, *Worldly* and *political* diſcharged, *Math.* 20. 25,
6, 27. Thirdly, *Antichriſtian* and *tyrannical* over the
ouls of the Lords People; ſett out by that Beaſt with
e ſeven heads and ten horns, *Revel.* 13. For as the ten
orned Beaſt holds forth the Pope and his Prelats as
alſe Prophets, and the ſcarlet whore a vile adulterous
Church, *Revel.* 17. ſo that firſt holds forth their Lord-
y, worldly politick, tyrannical, antichriſtian forme
f government; all one with that of our Prelats incon-
iſtent with, contradictory unto and everſive of the go-
ernment inſtituted by Chriſt in his Church; which as
t is in its own nature ſpiritual, ſo (as it is exerciſed un-
der Chriſt) it is only a miniſterial power and declara-
ory of his will.

We inquire next what is meant by Curats or Prelats
Miniſters. If you call them ſo. Theſe Curats are of
three ſorts. The firſt are theſe who being admitted
before the year 1649. have either by word or practiſe
[or both] yeelded up into the Prelats hands that power
which they had immediatly from Chriſt by the Presbyte-
ry to govern in the houſe of God with others; or to ſend
forth new labourers to Chriſts vineyard, as need re-
quires; or to adminiſtrat the publick worſhip in ane im-
mediat dependance on him: In a word they have taken
the keyes of the Houſe of God, and treacherouſly given
them to the hands of the Antichriſtian Prelat; and hes
quit with their charter from Chriſt and taken a new
charter from the Prelats; all which is evident by their
practical ſubmiſſion according to Law.

It is Objected here: That albeit thir Ministers hes given up their power of ordination or Jurisdiction into the Prelats hands, yet it will be hard to prove that they have given their power of preaching also: And therefore notwithstanding of what they have done they ought to be heard. *Answer*: As Christ never appointed, so he does not allow Ministers in his Church having a power of preaching without a power of ordination or Jurisdiction; so that our submission unto such for hearing of them would be ane acknowledgment of ane officer in Christs house that is not of his own appointment *Answer* II. this upgiving of theirs is a heinous sin, and a signal piece of treachery unto and revolt from their formerly professed head and Master; for which they deserve deposition from any office in Christs House, yea excommunication from the same; and therefore the Lords people ought to doe nothing that may seem to approve them in what they have done. *Answer* III. It seems to be granted here that we may not submit to their Jurisdiction, and yet they who hear submitts to it. *Answer* IV. we cannot see but they have given up their power of preaching into the Prelats hand, as well as their power of Jurisdiction and ordination. For first as they could not have exercised any power of ordination or Jurisdiction without his leave, so neither any power of preaching. II. as now they exercise Jurisdiction in their pretended Presbyteries and Sessions by his license and commission (in doing whereof they are his meer delegats and substituts) so by that same license and commission they preach; also as he authoritatively commands and regulats them in the exercise of Iurisdiction, the like the does as to preaching, and all the other parts of publick worship; so that they must preach &c. what he pleases and how he pleases. III. as he may take the exercise of Iurisdiction wholly out of their hands (as he hes already done that of ordination) by substituting officials &c. so (*eodem Iure*) he may inhibit them all to

preach

preach, and command them only to say service; so that indeed I see not where the difference lyes. If it be further said: they may thinke that their sitting does not differr from honest Ministers their sitting with and under the last Prelats. We answer *first* there is a hudge difference, as from other things, so from this, that these Ministers were not sett down by the Prelats, nor did ever sitt by a commission of delegation from them: But we remit the fuller clearing of this difference to the objectors who are called to have more serious thoughts about it then we are called to have. II. matters of duty or sin does not depend from our knowledge or ignorance, but from the Law of God: its a known rule. *ignorantia vincibilis non excusat a culpa*. Now the II. sorts of Curats are these who being admitted by the respective Presbyteries since the yeir 1649. have further taken collation from the Prelats; which collation, as it hes at least a virtuall reordination in the bosome of it (for the act of *Parliament* lookes upon them as no Ministers without this; and the narrative of the collation does bear that they have been tried and ordained, but does not say by the Presbytrie) so it beares also takeing of the oath of Canonicall obedience to his *Lo*: whereby they become his sworn vassals and slaves; yea the very collation it selfe without the oath seems to be a right clear acknowledgement of the pretended power of Prelats, and no doubt is devysed for that purpose, to be a mean of their establishment; for by it the Prelat is put in the place of the Presbytery. It is implyed that now he hes the power of triall, and ordination, consequently unto which only he conferrs the benefice; and this is the only thing which at first is called for at the hands of these Ministers for the establishing of Prelats.

The III. Sort of Curats are these who (besides all thir things) hes received ordination from the Prelats since their entry, and hes thrust themselves upon the Lords people with out their call and consent: These

then are the Curats and Prelats about whom the queſtion is; concerning, whom we grant that there may be ſome futher ſubdiviſions; for it is a greater fault to ſubmit cordially to the Prelats, or to be active in dryving on their deſigns, nor it is to ſubmi tt out of fear &c. II It is a greater fault to intrude upon the labours of faithful Miniſters thruſt out, nor it is to intrude upon a vacand congregration: Theſe indeed are heinous aggravations.

But the queſtion is about our ſubmiſſion, by hearing, &c. unto theſe who have ſubmitted unto theſe Prelats; which ſubmiſſion of theirs, and their deriving a power from them, is the fundamental guilt; the ſeveral wayes of which are exerciſed in the three members of the forgoing diviſion.

The II. thing propoſed to be explained is, concerning hearing of and ſubmitting unto thir Prelats and thir Curats, and the takeing the ordinances off their hands, for unfolding of which, conſider firſt that by the ordinances of God, are not only to be underſtood the Goſpel ordinances of preaching, but alſo Sacraments, and all other parts of publick worſhip, manner of teaching, Government and Diſcipline; all which hes been in uſe among us theſe yeares bygone, which we are bound to maintaine by the Word of God and Solemne Covenants; all which, and as many moe, as they ſhall pleaſe to invent. our Prelats and Curats pretends a power to adminiſtrat. II. as to what concerns hearing we would further conſider firſt what it is we are called to hear; we ſuppoſe it is not ane acted Comedy, or a diſcourſe of civil policie, trade or ſuch like; neither a Philoſophick lecture in a colledge, but it is ſomewhat for ſpiritual edification that we are ſpeaking of; nay it is the publick ordinance of preaching inſtituted by Chriſt for the begetting of faith &c. in the hearts of the Lords people. II. conſider whom we are to hear.

One authoriſed by Chriſt in his appointed way for carrying his meſſage to us; for upon the matter it may be the

Word

word of God, and yet not a meſſage from him, not the Goſpel ordinance of preaching, becauſe not delivered by one who hes a valid commiſſion. III. Conſider how we are to hear, we are to hear the Goſpell ordinance of preaching in the faith and expectation of the Lords bleſſing on his own ordinance, ſubmitting our ſelves to Chriſt in the meſſenger and meſſage; other wayes we take the Lords name in vain, ſeeing this at leaſt is requiſit to make that part of worſhip morally and ſpiritually good: This then is the hearing now in queſtion. IIII. We diſtinguiſh between occaſional hearing and fixed ſtated hearing: The queſtion is not, if a man were at his worke where one of theſe were preaching, if he might ſtay ſtill nothwithſtanding, or hear a word in the bygoing, his occaſion ſo requireing, or ſuppoſe their were no law for Prelats, or no great rumor that there were any of that gang in any Church with in the Land, if a man travelling throw the Countrey about his lawful affaires reſted on the Lords day where ſuch a one were without curious inquiry, and by ane inculpable ignorance, he might hear ſuch a one without ſin. But that is not the queſtion. It is concerning fixed and ſtated hearing to the makeing up of which theſe things doe concurr. firſt acts and lawes inſtituting and conſtituting ſuch and ſuch Church Officers. II. The actual fixing of them by vertue of theſe lawes and acts in ſuch places. III. They being fixed, takeing upon them to adminiſtrat all the Ordinances. IV. lawes and acts appointing every one reſpectively to ſubmitt unto the ſett Officers ſo fixed, and to take the Ordinances off their hands V. Peoples practiſe in ſubmitting to theſe acts and lawes, doing that really which is required (tho outwardly only) and no more is required. Now this ſort of hearing is a reall and formall ſubmitting unto the perſones heard, and ane interpretative (at leaſt) takeing of the ordinance off their hands. Whether they have power or no. And he who ſubmitts to them as to the

preaching of the word; may ſubmitt unto them in all other parts of worſhip or Ordinances, ſeing there is a like reaſon for all except there be a particular corruption in ſuch a part of worſhip that may ſcarr them. From this it appeares, that it is more pertinent to ask, whether it be lawfull to ſubmitt to the Prelats and the Curats, then to inquire, if it be lawfull to hear them. For firſt the term, *hearing*, being more ſtrict extenſive, relates only to ane Ordinance *viz.* to that of preaching. II, the term, *ſubmitt*, being more intenſive, does better expreſs the Nature of the hearing &c, about which the queſtion is, it is not every ſort of hearing that is here meant, but that hearing which is of the Goſpel Ordinance of preaching, and that in a ſtated way, which hes ſubmiſſion involved in it, as is above declared.

Thirdly we would advert, that when the Law requireing obedience and ſubmiſſion unto ſuch and ſuch Church Officers and attendance on them at ſuch times, requires a verball expreſs acknowledgement of them whether by word, promiſe or oath. Then if that be wanting, their ſubmiſſion unto, and acknowledgement of them might poſſibly be eſteemed not to be ſo full, but when the Law requires only peoples practiſe, then peoples practical obedience is enough to evidence their ſubmiſſion unto theſe Officers, as alſo their acknowledgement of them, and approbation of their way for why the Law requires no more of the people in their ſtation, for fixing of theſe creatures in their places: The queſtion then is, whether it be lawfull or not to hear, or ſubmitt to the Prelats and their Curats, as is above expreſſed.

But it is *Obiected* here, that beſides theſe things abovementioned to make up fixed ſtated hearing, it is further requiſit, that the party who hears live within the Pariſh, and that he hear not only now and then, but ordinarily.

Anſwer firſt: It is granted then that the hearing one placed in a Pariſh by theſe who lives within the Pariſh, is

is fixed ſtated hearing, as conſequently ſubmiſſion, as aboveſaid, eſpecially if their hearing be ordinary *Anſ:* II. The queſtion is not ſo much concerning fixed or ſtated hearing of them as Church Officers in the nationall Church of Scotland, and fixing them in and over that Church, and this is that which both the Law and practiſe aimes at primarily and directly, and at the other but indirectly and conſequentially, for it is but a circumſtantiall buſſineſs to be a member in this or that congregation, though never ſo fixedly. *Anſ:* III, ſeing all and every one of the Miniſters of the Goſpel ſtand in an actuall relation to the whole viſible Church and every part therof, and have ane habituall power to exerciſe all the parts of their office in every part thereof, according as they have a particular call, and ſeeing our practicall conſent to hear, or take any of the ordinances of their hands is a ſufficient call, *pro hac vice*, of that which *hic & nunc* does actually conſtitut ſuch a Miniſter our Miniſter; he actually and fixedly [*pro hac vice*] ſtanding between God and us, and actually diſpenſing Gods Ordinance unto us, his people, although otherwiſe he were a Miniſter in *America*, it followeth I ſay, that it is all one, whether we looke on them as Miniſters, or as our fixed Miniſters ſeeing they cannot but be our fixed Miniſters in that act, we mean *de facto*, *non de jure*. *Anſ: IV.* We ſee no difference to be noticed of any worth betwixt hearing of them ordinarily, and hearing of them now and then, for it is the ſame thing. And certainly if it be lawful to hear them once, it is lawful to hear them ordinarily, and is as reall ſubmiſſion unto them, and obedience to the Law, tho it be not ſo full extenſive; we grant alſo it hes a more bent influence on their fixing; but *majus & minus non mutant ſpeciem.*

Objection: If the party hearing ſhall before his hearing give a formall teſtimony againſt the Curats entry, his being Miniſter of that place, &c. that then his hearing

preaching of the word; may ſubmitt unto them in all other parts of worſhip or Ordinances, ſeing there is a like reaſon for all except there be a particular corruption in ſuch a part of worſhip that may ſcarr them. From this it appeares, that it is more pertinent to ask, whether it be lawfull to ſubmitt to the Prelats and the Curats, then to inquire, if it be lawfull to hear them. For firſt the term, *hearing*, being more ſtrict extenſive, relates only to ane Ordinance *viz.* to that of preaching. II, the term, *ſubmitt*, being more intenſive, does better expreſs the Nature of the hearing &c, about which the queſtion is, it is not every ſort of hearing that is here meant, but that hearing which is of the Goſpel Ordinance of preaching, and that in a ſtated way, which hes ſubmiſſion involved in it, as is above declared.

Thirdly we would advert, that when the Law requireing obedience and ſubmiſſion unto ſuch and ſuch Church Officers and attendance on them at ſuch times, requires a verball expreſs acknowledgement of them whether by word, promiſe or oath. Then if that be wanting, their ſubmiſſion unto, and acknowledgement of them might poſſibly be eſteemed not to be ſo full, but when the Law requires only peoples practiſe, then peoples practical obedience is enough to evidence their ſubmiſſion unto theſe Officers, as alſo their acknowledgement of them, and approbation of their way for why the Law requires no more of the people in their ſtation, for fixing of theſe creatures in their places: The queſtion then is, whether it be lawfull or not to hear, or ſubmitt to the Prelats and their Curats, as is above expreſſed.

But it is *Obiected* here, that beſides theſe things above-mentioned to make up fixed ſtated hearing, it is further requiſit, that the party who hears live within the Pariſh, and that he hear not only now and then, but ordinarily.

Anſwer firſt: It is granted then that the hearing one placed in a Pariſh by theſe who lives within the Pariſh, is

is fixed ſtated hearing, as conſequently ſubmiſſion, as aboveſaid, eſpecially if their hearing be ordinary *Anſ:* II. The queſtion is not ſo much concerning fixed or ſtated hearing of them as Church Officers in the nationall Church of Scotland, and fixing them in and over that Church, and this is that which both the Law and practiſe aimes at primarily and directly, and at the other but indirectly and conſequentially, for it is but a circumſtantiall buſſineſs to be a member in this or that congregation, though never ſo fixedly. *Anſ:* III, ſeing all and every one of the Miniſters of the Goſpel ſtand in an actuall relation to the whole viſible Church and every part therof, and have ane habituall power to exerciſe all the parts of their office in every part thereof, according as they have a particular call, and ſeeing our practicall conſent to hear, or take any of the ordinances of their hands is a ſufficient call, *pro hac vice*, of that which *hic & nunc* does actually conſtitut ſuch a Miniſter our Miniſter; he actually and fixedly [*pro hac vice*] ſtanding between God and us, and actually diſpenſing Gods Ordinance unto us, his people, although otherwiſe he were a Miniſter in *America*, it followeth I ſay, that it is all one, whether we looke on them as Miniſters, or as our fixed Miniſters ſeeing they cannot but be our fixed Miniſters in that act, we mean *de facto*, *non de jure*. *Anſ:* IV. We ſee no difference to be noticed of any worth betwixt hearing of them ordinarily, and hearing of them now and then, for it is the ſame thing. And certainly if it be lawful to hear them once, it is lawful to hear them ordinarily, and is as reall ſubmiſſion unto them, and obedience to the Law, tho it be not ſo full extenſive; we grant alſo it hes a more bent influence on their fixing; but *majus & minus non mutant ſpeciem.*

Objection: If the party hearing ſhall before his hearing give a formall teſtimony againſt the Curats entry, his being Miniſter of that place, &c. that then his hearing

ing cannot be accounted fixed ſtated hearing, in the ſenſe aforeſaid, much leſs ſubmiſſion unto him as ſuch.

Anſwer: firſt That Teſtimony (if of any availl) muſt not onely be againſt his entry, or being Miniſter of that place, but alſo againſt his being eſteemed a Miniſter of the Church of Scotland; ſeeing that is the thing that the Law aimes at primarily, as is ſaid; and that is the thing alſo we are primarily ſworn againſt in our ſolemn league and Covenant. II. this teſtimony (if any worth) muſt be as publick, open and frequent, as our practiſe in our hearing, &c. otherwiſe it cannot ſo much as remove ſcandall. III. the Curats laugh under thumb at this teſtimony (where it is admitted) and lookes on it only as a device of witt to ſhun ſuffering, and are glad that thereby they may get the people hanked in to ſubmitt unto them, everlaſtingly, as they thinke, and never more, again of this clandeſtine teſtimony. IV. if hearing &c. be looked upon, eſteemed and required as ane approbation of the call and office of Prelats and Curats, and as a token of ſubmiſſion unto them; then it cannot ſerve the turn here; ſee *Alting. probl.* *Pract* 18. Likewiſe *probl.* 9. *about being married with Popish Preiſts*, *Pag.* 304. but this is juſt our caſe; the importance of the Lawes, and all othet circumſtances conſidered, as appeares from what hes been ſaid concerning ſtated hearing, and will further appear in proſecution of argument. VIII. albeit in our thoughts and expreſſions we may preſcind, diſtinguiſh and divide between the duty of hearing &c. and the ſinfullneſs of ſubmitting unto, & approbation of the Curats and Prelats; yet our practiſe ownes no ſuch preciſion; but does allwayes involve a relation and ſubmiſſion unto both; the metaphyſicks in our heads does not influence our practice, neither can a teſtimony hinder or take off that ſubmiſſion and approbation which the practice off its own nature does involve. VI. if a teſtimony may take off the ſin of ſubmiſſion unto and approbation of the Prelats and

Curats

Curats in hearing &c. wherefore may not the like testimony take of the sin of idolatry in kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacramental Elements of bread and wine; but this it cannot doe, because in that act we are in a stated posture of outward, worship, having the Elements as the immediat object therof standing between God and us: for which see (amongst others) *Mr Rutherfords divine Right of Church Government Cap.* 1. *queſt.* 5. The like we say of the other; for in hearing &c. we are in ane outward stated way of worship &in that act we have the Prelat or his Curat standing between God &us, tho not to be worshipped, yet to be practically owned & submitted unto, as unto the messenger of the Lord of hosts; which practicall owning and submitting unto, a testimony can no more take off here, nor it can take off idolatry in the other case. From all this it does follow that hearing &c. of the Prelats and their Curats does necessarily involve submission unto them and approbation of them; notwithstanding of any testimony to the contrary; and that is all one to inquire concerning the lawfulness of hearing, &c. and of submission; neither can I see how a testimony of a privat nature can take of that which is the legall and publick intent of the action.

The III. thing to the explained is what is meant by *Lawfull*: where we would consider, that a thing may be lawfull by the Law of man, and yet not lawfull by the Law of God; Because God is greater then man: therefore Christian People, when the commands of men comes out, would allwayes try, if these commands of men be conforme to the revealed will of God or not. The question is to be understood of the latter, not of the former. III we may distinguish here between the reality of a thing and the lawfulness of a thing, or (which is all one) between its essence and its morall goodness; There may be *Veritas Metaphysica* where, there is not *Bonitas moralis*; a man in a fallen estate is a true man, though not morally good a

border

botder marriage is a true marriage for its ſubſtance, though not lawfully gone about, *Factum valet quod fieri non debuit.* Hence it followes, that although Prelats and Curats had the eſſentials of a Goſpell miniſtry, yet it will not follow, that we may take the ordinances off their hands; for that may be ſinfull and unlawfull.

Having explained the terms for clearing up of the ſtate of the queſtion, and being to ſpeak only to theſe who are really troubled about the preſent caſe; before I come to the reſolution of the queſtion, I would premiſe ſome things that I know they will grant. As *firſt*, That our Lord Jeſus hes inſtituted and appointed all the ſtanding officers of his Houſe, for the feeding and ruling thereof, Secondly, that theſe of Chriſts appointment are Miniſters and Elders, who are to govern in a collegiat way, *viz.* by Presbyteries ſeſſions, Synods & general Aſſemblies, with a direct immediat, ſubordination to Chriſt alone. Thirdly, That the Prelat Biſhop is none of Chriſts creatures, nor ſet in the Church by God, none of theſe gifts which Chriſt aſcending on high gave to his Church, but a meer humane creature and political device. Fourthly, That the Civil Magiſtrat hes no headſhip over the Houſe of God under Chriſt the mediatory way, that he is not at all ane officer in the Church the Houſe of God. Fiftly, that there is a government ſpiritual, eccleſiaſtick viſible over and in the viſible Church in the hands of Church officers, acting under Chriſt their King, by them he exerciſes his viſible mediatory kingly power; which government is formally, and in its own nature, diſtinct from the government civil, and not at all ſubject to the Civil Magiſtrat. Sixtly, That the Civil Magiſtrat, nor yet the ruling Church hes no power from God to inſtitut and appoint any Kynd of Church officers, or a new forme of Church government never appointed by Chriſt. Sevently, That the Civil Magiſtrat cannot juſtly deprive any Goſpel Miniſter either of his office, or the exerciſe thereof (eſpecially he having committed

committed no crime) neither can looſe the relation be-tween paſtor and people. Eightly, That the obligation of the National Covenant yet lyes on, notwithſtanding of any thing done to the contrary; yea that no perſon, nor perſons whatſoever hes power to looſe theſe obligations.

Theſe things being premiſed, I reſolve the queſtion in the negative, thus; *That for the Lords People in this Land to hear the Prelats and their Curats in the ſenſe aforeſaid, that is to ſay, to ſubmit to them or the ordinances of God* (pretended to be in their hands) *from them is ſinful and unlawful*. The reaſon inforceing this concluſion, and moving us to determin ſo, are theſe: Firſt, That which cooperats to the overturning of ane ordinance of Chriſt is ſinful and unlawful: But the hearing of the Prelats and their Curats, or ſubmitting unto them, cooperats to the overturning of ane ordinance of Chriſt: Therefore it is ſinful and unlawful. The *major* is undeniable; the *minor* I prove thus: The government of the Church by Paſtors, Teachers and ruling Elders in a collegiat way by Presbyteries, &c. with ane immediat dependance upon Chriſt, is an ordinance of God. But the ſubmitting to Prelats, &c. does clearly cooperat to the overturning of that yea to the thruſting it out of the Church: Therefore, &c. The *major* is preſuppoſed; To the *minor*, it may be ſaid; It is not we who thruſts out Chriſts government, it is the Parliament, Prelats, &c. *Anſw.* The Parliment indeed thruſts it out as Lawmakers, other Magiſtrats yea & Souldiers as executors of the Law, the Prelats as intruders, & you as obedient Subjects and Church members in your place & callings, willingly walkingafter the commandement; & that is all you can doe, or is called for at your hands; ſo that your concurring according to your calling in ſubmitting to the Prelats, &c. officers and ordinances, altogether inconſiſtent with Chriſts inſtitution, is a clear cooperating by you to the overturning thereof. But, Secondly, ye will ſay we

are

are forced to it. *First*, We doe it againſt our wills: Secondly, We mynd no ſuch thing in what we doe. *Anſw*, to the firſt, The will cannot be forced. Secondly, Ye doe it out of free choyſe, and ſo moſt willingly; Juſt as a merchant in a ſtorme at ſea caſts out his goods to ſave his life, which deed of his is ſimply voluntary, he choiſes it as the beſt in his preſent ſtrait. So yow, being put to it, either to joine in worſhip, or to ſuffer; make choyſe of ſin before ſuffering, which deed is ſo much the more ſinful, in that the preſent ſtrait is a providential call from God unto you for to give a teſtimony againſt the preſent courſe, which may be done by your refuſing to joine and ſubmit, and by your ſuffering upon that account, when you dare not, nor have not acceſs to give it anorher way: And it would be conſidered that the Lord of purpoſe ſends afflictions and perſecutions to try his people, whether or no they will adhere to every truth of his, and abſtain from every falſe and corrupt courſe? And their very ſtanding and abſtaining may be a confeſſing of Chriſt before men; for they who avow his truth confeſſeth him, and the contrare is a reall denying of him before men; and what they may expect that doe ſo, he tells us in his word. As to the II. we are not ſo much to looke to what we mynd or purpoſe, as to what neceſſarily and natively followes upon what we doe, for the doing of that which is right and acceptable to God, it is requiſit, thou purpoſe and deſire the thing thou art about; but to thy doing of evil, the deed without the purpoſe and deſire is ſufficient; *Bonum ex integro*, &c. and whatever thou purpoſe, yet the adverſe party does really purpoſe the overturning and out turning of the Government and officers of Chriſts inſtitution; and if thou in thy place and calling concurr with them in the *Mean*, thou muſt be interpreted to purpoſe the *End* alſo; yea altho thou both wiſhed and prayed that ſuch a thing came never to paſs; yet if thou do that which may further its bringing to

paſs

ſs, thou art guilty; much more if thou doe that which neceſſary to the bringing about thereof; and it is well owne that this courſe could not hold, if every one refuſed to joyne; and thou can only doe for thy ſelfe. We have been the longer in the anſwers to theſe, becauſe they may be made with equal ſtrength againſt ſeverall of the following arguments, where alſo the ſame anſwers may ſuffice.

Argument: II. That which brings in ane officer in the houſe of God, and a forme of Government which is not of Chriſts inſtitution, muſt be a ſinfull practiſe: But the hearing of, ſubmitting unto, and joyning in worſhip with and takeing the ordinances off the hands of the Prelats and their Curats is ſuch. Therefor it is a ſinfull practiſe. The *Maior* and *Minor* are both clear from theſe grounds firſt becauſe Chriſt hes inſtituted his own Government and all his own officers himſelfe, and hes not left that to any man, neither will ſuffer men to doe as they pleaſe, as is preſuppoſed. II. It is preſuppoſed alſo that the Prelats are not of Chriſts inſtitution. III. They require no more of thee, but that thou will take ordinances off their hands, and lookes upon it as a compleat ſubmiſſion unto them; neither can thou in thy place and calling doe any more (upon the matter) for their ſetlement; yea perhaps they would be angry, if they knew that you thought they needed any more from thee for their ſettlement to the full, except that: & albeit we grant, that countenanceing of them, & heartie cloſing with them, & with their government, would be uſeful to their ſettling, as to the *bene eſſe* of it; yet hearing &c. of them is ſufficient to the *eſſe* of it; neither can the chearfulneſs or heartineſs of cloſing with them be enjoyned by Law, theſe being internal acts of the ſoul.

Object. But thou may ſay perhaps: Thy hearing of them preach cannot be interpreted a ſubmiſſion to them, when thou art conſtrained to it. *Anſw.* Firſt, however when thou takeſt Baptiſm off their hands to thy Chyld

its a clear caſe. II. When thou heares them preach, thou either lookes upon the preaching as Gods ordinance of preaching, or not; and upon the ſpeaker as a ſent Miniſter ſtanding between God & thee, to bring Gods mynd unto thee, or not: If the firſt its clear thou takes the Ordinance off his hand. If the ſecond, Then thou mocks God, and ſo had better abſtain; and however, thy practice is a real, though not a verbal ſubmiſſion.

Arg. 3. That which ſerves to eſtabliſh a tyranny in the Church over the ſouls & conſciences of the Lords People muſt be ſinful & unlawful: But the hearing of, & ſubmitting, unto the Prelats & their Curats is ſuch. Therefore ſinful & unlawful: The *major* none will deny. The *minor* I prove thus: That which ſerves to eſtabliſh Prelats, ſerves to eſtabliſh a tyranny in the Church: But hearing &c. of them and their Curats ſerves to the eſtabliſhing of them: Therefor thy hearing of them &c. ſerves to eſtabliſh their tyranny. The *minor* of this is proven in the foregoing argument. The *major* is clear: Becauſe the Prelats are tyrans. Their tyranny appeares firſt in that they intrude themſelves upon the Church without any lawful power from Chriſt the Head thereof. II. The power they claime is not miniſterial, which only is of Chriſts appointment; but a ſort of abſolute Lordly Dominion over both Miniſters and People, which Chriſt hes expreſly forbidden in his Word. III. In ſpoiling the Lords People of their priviledge purchaſed by Chriſt to them; as for example; In obtruding upon them without Scripture, reaſon or their own conſent, Miniſters, Canons, Doctrines, modell of Worſhip and Ceremonies, as they pleaſe. IV. In makeing Miniſters abſolutely depend from them, not only as to their Miniſtrie, but alſo as to the exerciſe of all the parts of Worſhip, and ſo makeing the Servants of Chriſt their ſlaves. They muſt teach what the Prelats pleaſe, and that only; They muſt worſhip as they preſcryve, they muſt exerciſe Diſcipline [if any at all] in ane abſolute dependance on them, they muſt cenſure theſe faults [yea whether faults

ts or no] and these only which he commands, and
at way only as he commands; for all which purpo-
e requires ane oath of obedience from them unto
elfe, by vertue of which he is constituted Judge
wfulneſs and unlawfullneſs, expediencie and inexi-
encie of all that he commands, & neither they, nor
people may ask a reason of his commands, or so much
erce a Judgment of privat discretion about what he
mands; he under the name of things lawful and ho-
in that same Oath, brings in a number of things be-
the Word of God [&therfor contrare to it] inven-
s of men without number, which he from his papal
llible Judgment & by his *Autocratorick* power impoſes;
both Paſtors & people muſt receive and drink down
e, Now all these forsaid things are clear marks of
anny and tyrrants: It is considerable therfor that we
e out of Babylon, separated our selves from the
rch of Rome not only becauſe of her errours in
trine, Idolatry and Superſtition in Worship, but
ause of her tyranny in Government, & thought it our
y so to doe, then surely it muſt be our sin to doe any
g that may tend directly or indirectly to the eſtabliſh-
of such a tyranny in the Church of God, &indeed the
latticall Government this day exerciſed in the Church
cotland, differs not a handbread from the government
rciſed this day in the Church of Rome. If it would
e been our sin, to have ſtayed ſtill under that tyranny,
tainly it muſt be our greater sin; when we escaped scot
e, to return and ſit down peaceably under it again.

Argument IV. That which upon the matter and in
ct, directly or indirectly does tend to make another
ides Christ, head of the Church, muſt be sinfull
d unlawfull. But hearing of the Prelats and Curats in
ct and upon the matter does so much Therfor it
uſt be unlawfull. The *Major* will not be denyed by
y to whom I speak. The *Minor* is clear from this.
cauſe the party to whom the ſubmitt and with whom
their practiſe they cooperat is holden forth before]

does deryve their power from the King as supreme he & Governour in all causes ecclesiastick, for all the a establishing the Bishops and the government to be exe ciſedby them, giving power unto them, and in joy ing all to submitt to them, are founded on this nar tive, so that submitting unto them in obedience to the acts is in so far as we are called to it, a most reall set ing up another head of the Church beside Christ.

Arg. V. That which does concurr to the turning of t Kingdome of Christ, which is not of this world, into kingdom which is of this world, must be sinful. But joy ing with the Prelats and their Curats in maner forsaid such. Therfor unlawfull. The *ma*, or none will deny w denyes not Scripture, *John* 18: 36. The *minor* appear from these two grounds. *First*, That the Prelats way do turn the spiritual Kingdom of Christ into a worldly po litick Kingdom. II. That peoples submitting to the by hearing &c. is a partial concurring for carrying on that. The *first* I make plain by this parallel; *first* the hea of Christs Church is a spirituall one [*Christ himself*] upo whom all the Members, Pastors and people have ane im mediat dependance without the intervention of another But the head immediat of the Prelatical Church is a Po litical one, as is above declared viz: a worldly Gover nour, a real pope, which is enough of it selfe to make th Church a papacie, a meer antichristian politicall King dome, such as the papacy; for the thing that constitut the papal Church, and denominats one a member there of is the holding the popes supremacy, in all other things almost Papists disagree among themselves, but in thi they all agree, and therefore called Papists. II. the Lawes of Christs Kingdome are spirituall, Gods own word; but the Lawes of the Prelaticall Church or King dome are worldly, humane, and in nothing differing from state Lawes, yea the very same III. The Officers of Christs Kingdome under him are clothed only with ministeriall power, declarative of Christs mynd, but

those

who alone are invested with power in the Prelati-
Church, have a power and Dominion Lordly, like
Princes and great ones amongst the Gentiles
b.20.25. IV. The internall forme of Christs govern-
is spirituall, working inwardly upon the conscience,
he internall forme of the Prelats government is car-
ompulsive upon the outward man. We might further
nce in the end, rewards, punishments, all which are
uall in Christs Kingdome, but carnall and wordly in
relats Kingdome, which is clear from matter of fact
t pehaps they will deny it. However from this it is
, that the Prelaticall way is the turning of the spiri-
Kingdome of Christ into a carnall and worldly one.
that II. the hearing of the Curats in maner forsaid is
perating to the makeing that dreadfull change, as is
able: for what is their hearing but a practically ma-
themselves Subjects of this new Kingdome, going
as it were, of Christs Kingdome Spiritual; ima-
d now to be demolished (which is blasphemy to
e) and listing themselves under the Prelats collours,
what a dreadfull thing is that? Not only most sinful
selfe, as were easie to them; but also fearful in its
equences; for God will never bless that which is
his own ordinance, either for the good of thy soul or
of thine. Any thing that could be excepted here is
d away in *Arg.* 1. Only to this and all the forgoing
ments together with arguments 6. and 9. this gene-
answer is given: That which *per se* and by it selfe does
perat to the overturning an ordinance of Christ, esta-
hing of prelacy & a tyranny in the Church &c. is sin-
is granted: That which cooperats only *per accidens*,
ccident, is denyed. But the hearing &c. does coo-
t per se, to the fixing of prelacy, is denyed: That
oncurrs per accidens, it is granted; and therefore
t the conclusion followes upon any of these premisses
enyed: For reply to this *Consider first*: that it is not
one, to be a partiall or cooperating cause, and to be

ane accidentall cauſe, which is abſurd, much leſs the is every partial cauſe *in eodem genere*, in that ſame kynd, a accidentall cauſe. II. a cauſe is either naturall or mor a natural or phyſical cauſe is that which hath a na turall or reall influence in producing of ſome effect: morall or legall cauſe is that which hath a moral or lega influence [the effect being often only a legal reſult] b vertue of which the effect is imputed to it; as one wh counſels, perſwades, does not hinder when they ma and ought, commands a thing or obeyes a command when the thing commanded is only a legall reſult; an this is the preſent caſe: for theſe who hear and ought t hinder the ſetleing of Prelatick Governmet and albe they cannot hinder it poſitively, yet they may doe it ne gatively by refuſeing to joyne in under the Prelats, an albeit they doe not command theſe things, yet they giv obedience in ſo far as is requyred; and if the effect b imputed to the party commanding, wherefore muſt not alſo be imputed to the party obeying that command Is there any difference here. III. That which is a cauſ *per accidens* in reference to a natural effect; may be a mo ral cauſe *per ſe*; as he who ſetts a houſe on fire, hes no na tural influence on the burning of it, yet the effect is ju ſtly imputed to him; the queſtion here is not concer neing a natural, but concerneing a moral reſult. IV that hearing &c. be only ane accidental cauſe in fixin prelacy &c. the accidentality muſt either be *ex parte cauſ* or *ex parte effectus*, in the cauſe or in the effect, it is no *ex parte cauſæ*, this we thinke none will ſay; for the hear not, as they are *Iohn* and *Iames*, or as *Shoemaker* or *Tailors* for example; But as they are Chriſtians an Subjects: ſo *Swarez diſp.* 17; *Sect* 2. Neither is ther any accidentality here *ex parte effectus*; for that muſt ei ther conſiſt in the accidental connexion between the ef fects Produced, as the finding of a treaſure is acciden tally knitt with the digging of the earth: or it muſt con ſiſt in the accidentall connexion of two or moe cauſe

together

ogether, in order to the producing of such ane effect; for example, a man going by ane old ruinous house or wall, that same very instant a stone falls doun and wounds him; but none of these two can have place here, Not the first, for between these two effects, receiving of the message and submitting to the messenger [upon which establishing of prelacy and tyranny in the Church overturning of Christs spiritual government &c. kyndly followes] there is a connexion no wayes accidentall or fortuitous; but on the contrair first naturall, a rising from the relation between messenger and message, between ordinances and dispenser; the receiving of the one of which must necessarily therefore be ane acknowledgement of, and submission unto the other; yea, as hes been said, we cannot hear him once, but *pro hac vice de facto* we constitut this man in the circumstantiat case our Minister; or *interpretative* doe so acknowledge him; neither can we hear him oftener, or ordinarily in one congegration, but our practise tends to fix this individual person in that congregation; which effect natively followes upon the practise, although there were a hundereth testimonies to the contrair, II. this connexion rises from the publick intention of the Law and the outward maner how the case is stated between Magistrat and Subject, which speaks forth the takeing of ordinances off the hands of such officers so qualified, invested with such offices and having their offices such a way; from which followes first a connexion morall between ordinances and such officers, even as such. II. that our practise of hearing &c. hes for the result of it, as much the receiving of such officers, even as such, as it hes the receiving of the ordinances themselves.

Object. It will be said possibly, that these conjoined effects of fixing Prelats &c. are not intended by these that heares &c. and therefore that they follow only accidentally on their practice. *Answ.* Their practise considered in it selfe hes a naturall propensenes to produce these

effects, as hes been ſhowne; And therefore they follow *per ſe* upon their practiſe whether they intend ſuch things or no. II. albeit their practiſe had no propenſeneſs to the producing of ſuch things, yet if they intend them, the effect will not be *per accidens*, as is clear in him who digs the earth, purpoſely to find a treaſure; and that in hearing &c. there is intended the fixing of Prelacy &c. even by them who doe hear. We make out this *firſt* becauſe there is a publick intention of eſtabliſhing of it, with which they cooperat, which publick intention, their teſtimony of a privat nature cannot infringe, as hes been ſhowen. II. granting that thoſe who heares &c. intends no ſuch thing with ane intentention formal or phyſical; yet there is ane intention here that we call morall, virtual and interpretative. For why when a moral agent does any thing that otherwiſe is a duty and with all ſees or may ſee that ſome ſinfull thing is conjoyned with it, that will neceſſarily follow upon his practiſe as the effect thereof, that then and in that caice he is to goe on, that effect is to be imputed to him, and he is to be interpreted to have intended it, although in his heart he hate it and wiſh the contrair; and this is a thing [we conceive] all ſound Divines and Moraliſts agrees upon; but thoſe who hear &c. are moral agents, and they cannot but ſee theſe things to follow upon their practiſe: therefore they morally purpoſe the bringing about of them.

Object: If it be ſaid further: that hearing is a duty and a mean of ſalvation, and therefore we muſt hear whatever follow. *Anſwer*: firſt: by this argument we might hear a Jeſuite or Maſs Preiſt, if they would but profeſs to preach ſound doctrine. II. we may not doe evill that good may come of it, and that which otherwiſe were a duty leaves off to be a duty when clogged with ſin; at leaſt upon the matter. III. we are not to be too ſollicitous about events concerning our being deprived of means of ſalvation, but ought to committ theſe

theſe matters to God whoſe it is to provyd for theſe of his own houſe and family; and in the mean tyme ought to be diligent in thoſe meanes and duties that we may lawfully perform and make uſe of; and ought to beware leaſt under the notion of duty we ſin againſt the Lord. Neither II. is the connexion between the cooperating cauſes in order to the producing of theſe ſinfull effects of fixing prelacy &c. meerly caſual or accidental; for all cooperating agents ſtand in a fixed relation to one another; they are all deliberat agents, and there is the connexion of a Law by which Goſpel officers are thruſt out, Antichriſtian officers thruſt in, the ordinances of Chriſt overturned, a tyranny eſtabliſhed in the Church and unto which things people are commanded to ſubmitt in their place and calling, and practically doe ſo; which things hes been already cleared.

Object. If it be ſaid here: That people in their hearing &c. does it not out of obedience to theſe Lawes, but in obedience to the Law of God, We *Anſw.* firſt that the Law of God doth indeed injoyne hearing, but doth not injoyne ſinfull hearing, and therefore not the hearing of Prelatiſts; therefore this hearing is not in obedience to the Law of God. II. the hearing &c. is formall obedience to theſe humane Lawes, becauſe it is gone about in a way of ſtated obedience, unto which (in reference to humane Lawes) there is nothing required but the making of them, promulgating and publiſhing of them, and putting them in execution, together with peoples doing of the things commanded, upon the knowledge they have, or may have of them; and that although their will were nether influenced by the authority of the command, nor hit by the threatning expreſſed in the ſanction of it; all which is clear enough in point of outward and ſinfull obedience, albeit unto obedience inward and morally good more be requiſit. We have inſiſted the longer in reply to this anſwer, partly becauſe it ſtrikes at ſo many arguments at once, and partly becauſe of the weight laid on it, albeit not for any weight that is in it.

Argum. VI. The embraceing of a fundamental error in Religion though but in practise and interpretatively is sinful and unlawful: But the hearing of the Curats &c. is in practise, [in effect] and must be interpreted the embraceing of a fundamental error: And there for is unlawful. The *major* is undenyable; Yea the main ground on which we separated from the Church of Rome was, errors fundamental, which they denyed, and we drew by consequents from their doctrine. The *minor* I prove: The saying, that Christs visible Church is not his spiritual and Mediatory Kingdome is a fundamental error, but the hearing of the curats &c, . [at least in practice] is the embraceing of this, and therefore a fundamental error. The *major* of this I prove: The saying that Christ is not a King is a fundamental error; But the saying that this visible Church is not his Mediatory Kingdome, is the saying, he is not a King [at least by consequence] for those who denyes overturns one part of his Kingly office, doe deny or overturn by consequence the whole of it, seeing there is a necessary connexion betwixt the parts thereof.) And therefore a fundamental error. The *major* of this is evident; for if Christ be not a King [which is clear against Scripture, all Catechisms and orthodoxe Confessions] then he is not Mediator [for the parts of his Mediatory office are inseparable] if not Mediator, then not Christ, and so not the foundation of our faith. Contrary to 1. *Cor.* 3. *v.* 11. The *minor* of this also is evident, because if Christ have not a Kingdome, he is not a King.

Object. Thou wilt perhaps say: The Church triumphant is his Kingdome. *Answ.* We will not inquire here, 1. For how that Church above may he said to be a part of Christs Mediatory Kingdome: But is there not a Kingdome of grace as well as a Kingdome of glory. Which Kingdome of grace is most properly his Mediatory Kingdome. *Object.* But it will be said then, the invisible Church, and not the visible, is Christs donative Mediatory Kingdome. *Answ.* 1. I grant that the metaphors in Scripture of body, branches, spouse are most fitly

fitly applicable to his invisible Church in reference unto Christ the Head, root and husband. II. That these who are, or are to be of the invisible Church, are the *end*, the *finis cui*, for which all the ordinances are appointed, and a government sett up and keeped up. But III. I deny, that the invisible Church as such is formally a Kingdome for the members hereof have neither lawes, governours nor government, but as they are members of the visible Church, & that good which they get which makes them differ from others is the effect of the ordinances that they are under, as they are members of the visibl Church; unto which I confess there is necessary, the cooperation of the Spirit of God makeing his ordinances effectuall. The minor of the forgoing Syllogisme viz that the hearing of the Curats &c. is practically the embraceing of this error is cleared from these grounds *first* the Prelats by their practise overturns the spiritual Kingdome of Christ, and turns it into a worldly politicall one; as is proven by the forgoing arguments. II. becaus the most of that way in opinion denyes Christ to have any visible Kingdome or Government distinct from that of the civil Magistrat. III. those who submitt unto the ordinances, pretended to be in Prelats and Curats hands, embraces this error, becaus they close in with that which is the effect therof; and is constituted by it. IV. we see in scripture, that although a man both in opinion and profeffion hold that there is a God, yet if his practise be opposit and tend to the overturning of that truth, by consequence, he is esteemed ane Atheist *Psal.* 14: 1. *Tit.* 1: 16. So that albeita man should hold in opinion, that Christ is a King, and that his visible Church is his Meditatory Kingdome, and also profes the same by words, yet if in practise [though out of fear] he shall cooperat with these who overturns this truth, the Lord will esteem him ane overturner of it, a Dethroner of Christ, and a drinker in of this fundamental error, whatever himselfe or others thinke: Now wether or no folks practicall submitting to this pretended

ded ecclesiastick Authority will not prove as much. Let any man judge.

It is excepted here first: That the Doctrine of Church Government was never repute by any Orthodox writer among fundamental truths, the simple ignorance where of without error or obstinacy doth condemn; yea, and that soundness of Church Government was never repute among the essentialls necessary for constituting a visible Church, except by Separatists and Brounists, and therfor ye may guess what. For answer to this we advert first: That Divines are not yet well agreed upon these things that are fundamentall; and albeit these things (the simple ignorance where of inferrs damnation) be indeed fundamentall; yet there may be other things besides these which are fundamentall also. II. There are some things primarily and formally fundamentall, other things secundarily and by necessar consequence only, likewise there are some errors primarily and formally overturning the foundation, others only by necessary consequence: We say the Popish religion is guilty of errors in fundamentalls, cheifly concerning the Preistly office of Christ; and yet in terms they hold the Preistly office of Christ, but with all maintaines such things as by necessary consequence overturns the same we advert. III. That Government of Christs Church includes many things: As first Christs lawes. II. His ordinances. III. His Officers. IV. The power committed to them. V. The measure of the power. VI. The maner and way how that power is to be put in exercise &c. In a word all the outward proper Gospel means of Justification and Sanctification, or the means of the application of the sacrifice of Christs death, of conversion, of edification, sanctification all which means Christ institutes and appoints by vertue of his Kingly mediatory power, and ordaines to be execut, administrat and made use of in his appointed way, which meanes alone he blesses for his peoples good, and with which alone (in ordinary) he concurrs by his spirit. All which

Prelats

Prelats dispose on at their pleasure, at least the power that they usurp is a power of disposing upon all these things, as they please: *Upon the lawes*, by changing and adding, makeing the law of God of none effect by their traditions; *Upon the ordinances*, by changing of them, and putting others in their place; *Upon the Officers*, by setting up new kynds of officers viz: themselves and others not of Christs institution and by exautorating and vassaling the officers of Christs own institution, and by depriveing them of the exercise of their power: *Upon the power it selfe* by changing the nature of it, usurping of it in a measure that Christ hes reserved to himselfe, and exercised in a way not appointed, but forbidden of him, Now taking the Government of the Church complexly thus, for the power it selfe, the severall parts, acts, measure and mannr thereof, together with its subject and object [which it effects and without which it cannot so much as be understood it being a relative thing] and not for any share or part thereof; in a word, take it for all those things [purely Ecclesiastick we mean] that are to be exercised in Christs Church, under and in a dependance upon him, as head and King thereof; the overturning thereof; will be found to be the overturning of fundamentals in Christianity, at least by consequence. For why. Those who overturns this Government, by consequence they dethrone Christ from being King of his visible Church and takes away his Kingly office. yea in this, by consequence at least, they make the sacrifice of his death ineffectuall, for he hes a Kingly office for that purpose, that therby the sacrifie of his death may be made effectuall; for the overturning of this Government is the overturning of all the meanes appointed by his wisdome and authority for the makeing that sacrifice effectual, as hes been said: And that Pelats does *de facto* overturn all these things, in some places is a known truth, and whatever is done among us as yet, it is the same power that is established here; peoples concurring therfor to the establishing of it [whether they

theyhead or owne theſe conſequences or not] muſt be a ſinfull thing, and that is all which we ſay, and we conceive no ſound writer will be againſt this.

In reference to the I I. part of this exception conſider firſt that the thing wherby a Church viſible is formally conſtitut (upon the part of the profeſſors we mean) is the profeſſion of ſubſtantiall fundamentall goſpell truths, Hence it followes, that if either there be ane open denying of ſuch truths, or a profeſſion of ſuch errors, as by conſequence overturns theſe fundamentall truths, that then and in that caſe that Church leaves off formally to be a Church, even as to the eſſentials, eſpecially if all the profeſſores owne and avow all theſe conſequences, otherwiſe not; which thing may hold good in the caſe of Church government, as above deſcrived. Conſider II. that a Church may be very ſound and full in their profeſſion of all Goſpell truths, and yet may be hindered as to the practiſe of ſeverall of them by ſome extrinſecal impediment, the want of which practiſe may be their griefe and burden, in which caſe, ſuch a Church is not corrupt, either in eſſentialls or accidentalls, albeit violently mutilat *ab extrinſeco*. III. It may be the error of Brouniſts & Separatiſts that takeing Church government only for ſome part thereof, they withall hold, that the wanting of that *de facto* did nullifie the Church, but we are far from ſaying that, and therfor are not ſo ſeverly to be animadverted upon.

It is excepted II. That the cheife part of Chriſts mediatory Kingdome lyeth in governing the inviſible Church by ſpiritnall inviſible influences, and that the holding of this is only a fundamentall truth and that therfor the denying of externall Government and putting another in the place thereof is not practically a fundamentall error, neither is cooperating therwith ane imbraceing practically a fundamentall error. *Anſ:* I. Chriſt as King and head of his Church militant hes many things committed unto

unto him. As *first* the appointing of Lawes, offices and Ordinances &c. for feeding and governing his Church, and the setting up a Government in it for that purpose, as is above described. II. The sending of his spirit for makeing these means effectuall. III. The ordering of all things in a common providence for the good of the elect: But if we will consider his Government as exercised under him, it does formally consist only in the first. For why. As to the III. Christ exercises his power mediatory over things in a common providence, not by formal Lawes, officers &c. Neither as over persones, but by disposing of them as things. Neither as to the II. does the spirit worke ordinarily, but by the outward means makeing them effectual: Neither hes the invisible Church as such, and as contradistinct to the visible Church, either lawes officers, rewards or punishments; and consequently no Government. And as for these influences of the spirit, they are formally the effects of the Government visible and other ordinances as made effectuall by the operation of the holy spirit, or the effects of his operation upon the hearts of the elect in concurrence with the ordinances. II. We say that a Government by invisible influences is either unheard of, or else very improper; for in that sense the stars and planets may be said to have a Govrnement in and over sublunarie bodies whom they indivisiblie influence, which although it goe near the Scripture phrase *Iob* 38 Yet who will deny that phrase there to be improper. III. we fear that the holding of a Government by immediat influences shall goe nearer Enthusiasme, nor the taxed opinion goes near Brounisme, You see how warry practicall Divines are in conceding that which they call the immediat testimony of the spirit; in concedingwhereof, they hold it rather to be ane act, and effect of prerogative and soveraignity, nor of any regular Government. IV. As the outward Government of the visible Church is formally a Government which these invisible influences

influences are not; ſo we canot ſee but the one is as fundamental as the other; for both are founded upon the covenant of redemption, by vertue whereof Chriſt the Mediator is impowered to ſend his Spirit, as well as to ſett up a government in his houſe and appoint all the outward meanes of grace; albeit we confeſs his working with the Father as God by the Spirit does antecede the Covenant. From this it followes firſt that if there be any thing fundamental in Chriſts Kingly Mediatory Government (which to deny ſeems hard) that then it does moſt formally conſiſt in the outward Government of the viſible Church. II. that the ſubverting of this externall Government and putting another in the place therof is practically a fundamental error. III, that the cooperating therto is practically the imbraceing of a fundamental error. IV. that it is ſin.

It is excepted III. that this Government ſuppones that if the Government of Chriſts Houſe be ſubverted, how pure ſo ever the ordinances and doctrine were, we could not communicat in ſuch a Church without being involved in a fundamentall error.

Anſw. this is falſe [with leave] for notwithſtanding of any thing that is contained in this argument, we may freely hold that it is very lawful to communicat with a Church where there is no publick exerciſe of government. II. that even a Church which hes a Government impoſed upon it, which according to principles of the impoſers is ſubverſive of the Kingly power of Chriſt (which every corruption in Government is not) yet leaves not off for all that to be a Church, for ſome may reiect it altogether, others who ſubmitts unto it may diſowne the conſequents of it which natively follow on it, either becauſe they labour to put a better conſtruction upon it nor it will bear; who notwithſtanding ſins in ſo far as they cooperat for the eſtabliſhng of that: Now we may freely communicat with thoſe of that Church, whether publikly or privatly, in ſo far as our communicating is

not a ſubmiſſion to that Government, or a practical incurrence to the eſtabliſhing of it.

Arg. VII. Thoſe who are moſt groſsly, incorrigibly and avowedly ſcandalous, it is not lawful to hear them or ſubmitt untothem as unto Goſpel Miniſters: But the Prelats and their Curats are ſuch: Therefore it is not lawful to joyn with them. I prove the *Major*. If it be moſt finful for a Presbytery to admitt perſones ſo ſcandalous and obtrud them on people, then it muſt be unlaful any way by word or practiſe to ſubmitt unto them; for in the circumſtantiat caſe there is alike reaſon for both; but the former is trúe. For the latter, the *minor* is clear. For the Prelats and the Curats are guilty of perjury in breach of Covenant, of defacing the Lords worke and perſecuting his people, caſting out the ſpiritual Government and officers of Chriſt, and bringing others of mens devyſing into their place. In a word, of all the moſt ſcandalous crymes ſpoken to in the former arguments, and all this in ane incorrigible and avowed manner.

Againſt the probation of the *Major* it is excepted that a Presbytry may ſin in ordaining a perſon to the Miniſtry when it connot be a ſin in people to hear that perſon being ordained; even as a miniſter may ſin in admitting a ſcandalous perſon to the Communion, when yet it will not be ſinful for a people to communicat with him; and therefore it is thought a wonder, it ſhould be ſaid, that there is alike reaſon for both. *Anſ:* It is granted that a presbytry may ſin in admitting a Miniſter and a congregation hear him in very many caſes without ſin; it is likewiſe granted that a miniſter may ſinfully admitt a perſon to communicat & yet others communicat with him without ſin. But notwithſtanding the *major* of the argument will appear ſtrong not only in it ſelfe. But alſo ſufficiently confirmed, if we will but conſider firſt that it is not every ſort of ſcandals that we ſpeak of here, but ſuch as are moſt groſs and hainous being direct breaches

ches of the II. and III. commands, groffer then murther and adultery which are but breaches of the VI. and VII.. II. thir ſcandals are both open notorious and avowed. III. thir ſcandals are made the qualifications of the man in reference to his admiſſion, inſtead of theſe qualifications required in the word of God. IV. thir ſcandals are the conditions upon which people muſt accept of him and ſubmitt unto him in taking the ordinances off his hands; for it is publickly declared that there is no other capable of ane ſoffice in the Church but thoſe who are ſo indued. V. that hearing is not ſimply hearing, but ſuch a hearing as involves ſubmiſſion to the ſcandalous man as to our Miniſter, as is already proven; and notonly ſo, but its ſuch a hearing as is equivalent to a call; ſeing of its own nature it tends to fix him and is a partial fixing of him in that place, or at leaſt for makeing him our Miniſter *pro hac vice*; all which is clear: for as the Prelats allow not the Lords people the liberty of a call, ſo they know they would give none a call who have ſuch qualifications; and they on the contrare being reſolved to have them all ſo endued whom they ſend forth, they force the people by external means practically to accept of them; and they being forced does that which is equivalent to a call. All which being conſidered makes the Major ſufficiently ſtrong. As to what concerns its confirmation, We would further ask firſt whether or not the People hes a priviledge of calling a Miniſter, as well as a Presbytery hes a power of ſending him forth and ordaining him? II. whether or not a congregation in giving a call to a Miniſter ſo qualified with thir ſcandals did not as much ſin as the Presbytery in ordaining him? III. whether or no a congregation for their honeſty deprived of their priviledge of calling by a Presbytery (*quod abſit*) having ſuch a ſcandalous perſon thruſt in upon them in the expreſs termes abovementioned did not ſin in ſitting down under ſuch a mans Miniſtry. And whether or

hey would be involved in the same sin & guilt, seing
bytery hes no Lordly Dominion over them, and
they are to take nothing off their hands by way of
obedience. And lastly we ask if there be any mat-
wonder in any of these things, surely we see none.
albeit neither the *Major* without all limitation will
conclud, nor yet the parallel between pastor and
e hold, yet both beeing understood, as is above
ft, they will prove sufficiently concludent. *If it*
Then you separat from the ordinances for the sins
owworshipers, contrare to the doctrine of these of
own party. *Its answered* these of our party who
e most Zealously and accurately against separation
that account, yet grants that when the sins of pa-
nd people are such that we cannot frequent the or-
nces unless we be interpreted to approve of their
that then and in that case it is sinful for us to joyn.
the sins of Prelats and their Carats are such; for
are involved in the very nature of the office, and
heir way of having it, so that we cannot submitt to
one but *ipso facto* we approve the other: neither will
statio contraria facto, solve the bussines here, tho
e be access to make it.

is further *instanced* here: when people are deficient
ue exoneration of themselves, according to their
ion in bearing testimony against the sins of Pastor or
ple, that then indeed they may be interpreted ap-
vers of them: But when they are not deficient in
duty, then they cannot fall under any such inter-
ation. This is further confirmed by the example
Ely his Sones, whose wickedness did not warrand
Jewes their withdrawing from the ordinances in
tyme. *Answ.* we distinguish here between sins that
personal and sins the are involved in the office or in
way of having the office: As for sins meerly perso-
l whether in Minister or in people, we thinke a testi-
ony against them may well suffice to exonerat our con-

ſciences, free us of partakeing of the guilt, and hind
us from being juſtly reputed approvers of ſuch practi
Howbeit *I* confeſs the clandeſtine teſtimony will ſc
ſely ſuffice; for according to Chriſts preſcryved w
privat meanes proving unſucceſsful, we ſhould at len
bring the buſſineſs to the Judicatory, and leave it th
upon the conſciences of the members; and if the
dicatory be corrupt give a teſtimony againſt bo
But as to the ſins that are involved in the office or in
way of coming to the office, as is above expreſſed,
teſtimony whatſoever can free the people from being
ſtly reputed approvers of theſe ſins and ſharers in the
if they ſhall take the ordinances off their hands by v
tue of ane office ſo qualified and come by. As for t
of Elies ſons, their ſins were perſonal and not ſins
their office (un leſs it were in the abuſe of it, which is
perſonal fault) for they neither had ane unlawful offi
nor yet their office by ane unlawful officer; ſo that t
peoples takeing ordinances off their hands did neith
approve the one nor the other, And albeit the peop
be not expreſsly warranted to forbear ſacrificing b
cauſe of their wickedneſs, yet it is likely they did i
for it is ſaid, men did abhore the offering of the Lo
becauſe of their wickedneſs; and how they could a
horre the offering and offer at one and the ſame tym
we doe not well ſee, and if ſo, we doe not find the
reproved for not offering.

Upon their grounds we build the Argument VII
If people cannot hear, &c. the Prelats and their Cura
without approving *ipſo facto* of their groſs ſcandalou
ſins, their unlawful offices, and the ſinful and unlaw
ful way of having their offices, then their hearing mu
be ſinful; But the former is true; Therefore the la
ter. The *major* is undeniable. The *minor* is alſo cle
from what hes been preſently ſaid; Yet for furthe
clearing of it *Conſider firſt*, That the relation betwee
Paſtor and People is far greater then that between peo

ong themſelves; for it is not only a ſuperadded
n. but alſo a relation in the direct line; whereas
er is only in the collateral; we muſt looke upon
iſter as ſtanding between the Lord and us when
enſes ordinances; but we are not to looke ſo up-
ple, when they pertake of ordinances and join in
p with us. *Conſider* II. That the thing that
hem in that relation and formally (to ſpeak ſo)
them in between the Lord and us is nothing per-
but meerly their office, all the concernments of
both as to the eſſentials and adherent proper ad-
notour and known, and thoſe whether corrup-
qualifieing, we muſt eye, as it were, and
thorow towards God in takeing ordinances of
nds; which practiſe ſeems to carrie in the bo-
f it ane approbation of all thoſe things, ſeeing
rdinances comes, as it were thorow the office ſo
ed. But then III. Seeing they either have ane un-
office, as Prelats; or holds it of this unlawful of-
and hes it from him in ane unlawful way; and
their officers are thruſt in, & intrude themſelves
: and we are commanded to ſubmit unto them
e the ordinances off their hands, after that man-
d under that notion, and as qualified with all the
ul qualifications above expreſſed: and ſeeing the
which we formally obey (as hes been ſhewed;
ats to the fixing of them in their places, there-
muſt involve a practical approbation of all thoſe
IV. Many Miniſters admitted before the Year
choyſes rather to ſuffer themſelves to be thruſt
the exerciſe of their miniſtry nor that they ſhould
Synod with the Prelat, the reaſon whereof can
e this, becauſe their ſitting in Synod with them
involve ane approbation of Prelacy, ſeeing there
ing but ſitting required of them: therefor peoples
ordinances off the hands of the Prelats and their
s muſt involve ane approbation of Prelacy and all
ful adjuncts of it.

Obje. If it be ſaid that the Synod is nothing b
cypher Synod in which they ſitt to take orders
them. *Anſw.* That I grant: but yet according to
grounds there is there ane ordinance of God as to
eſſentials. *Viz.* In the Prelat a Presbyter with an
tended power of Juriſdiction, between which an
Prelacy you may make a mental prescision, juſt a
tween that and the power of preaching you may
ſcind in hearing &c. but as your practiſe in ſitting
wes no ſuch precision, but neceſſarily involves an
probation of the whole, ſo the peoples practiſe in
ing knowes it as little, and ſo involves ane approb
of the whole; and as a teſtimony cannot ſolve the
ſineſs in the matter of ſitting, far leſs can it doe i
matter of hearing, for why. Your ſitting [as P
tiſts ſay] is not meerly to receive orders, but to j
in acts of diſciplin and government; whereas the p
which the Curats hes to diſpenſe ordinances is ſo
derived from the Prelat.

Argum. IX. The guilt of perjury is a dreadfull
But the hearing of the Prelats and their Curats, as
ſaid inferrs the guilt of perjury. And therefore
dreadfull ſin. The *major* needs no proofe. The
I prove thus; The doing of any thing that does
concurr to the making of Prelacy take root in
Church does inferr perjury. The *major* is clear fro
Solemn League and Covenant *Article* II. whe
ſwear to endeavour in our places and ſtations to ex
prelacy, therfor the doing of any thing to make i
root muſt be reall perjury. The like alſo may be
cluded from I. *Article* The *major* is made ſo clear
gum. I. That there is no denying of it; for why.
require no more of us in our places and callings for
eſtabliſhment but hearing &c. And it is further c
derable, that hitherto it hes been looked upon am
us as a ſufficient note of profeſſion of ſuch a faith
ſuch away, to frequent all the ordinances as called

so sometymes unwillingly, and is sufficient among all these who require not ane explicite Church Covenant with the independants, so that their is no shifting of it, yea it seems very clear, that the meer frequenting of the ordinances pretended to be in their hands is like the laying of dung to the root of a tree, and certainly without this dung, they would never take root in this Church: And it would be further remembered, that according to article VI. albeit all should divide from us, yet we are never to suffer our selves to be divided from our duty directly or indirectly, by whatsoever terrour or perswasion, but should all the dayes of our life, zealously and constantly continue therein &c.

Argum. X. That which is contraire to a Solemn promise made before God in the congregation of his people equivalent to ane oath. must be sinfull and unlawfull. But the submitting unto the Prelats and their Curats in maner forsaid is such. Therefore unlawful. The major none will deny, if upon the maner it be lawful, which is supponed. The minor is clear from the practise of our Church, where a minister is admitted, one of the Parish in name of the rest stands forth in the midst, and there most solemnly promises submission to him in the Lord, adherence to him and all due incouragement, all the rest present and giving a tacite consent. Now the submitting to a Curat, tho but in practise; when the other is thrust out for his faithfulness at least in the circumstantiat case, wherein the publik intent of hearing him &c. involves in it a new relation to the Curat, and so tends to the breaking of that relation to him who is truly their minister it must be quite contraire to that promise, especially seing the promise stands binding so long as he lives, or is not loosed from that power that put him there, neither does it availl to say, he is now out, and yow cannot help it. why his out thrusting is neither your fault nor his, tho both your affliction, and violent out thrusting can nether loose the relation betwixt yow and him, nor absolve yow from your promise. It is confessed that

violent thrusting him out and driving him away, does interrupt the exercise of his ministry in that congregation, and makes his not preaching to them and their not hearing of him inculpable for the tyme, as also does not hinder them to take any of the ordinances off the hand of another honest man, seing that practise is no way of the same importment with the other. It may possibly be granted also, that when the grounds of thrusting out is somewhat in the person and not in the cause, and when the congregation can have another honest man upon the same terms they had him, when the Judicatory either formally does loose him, or may be supponed interpretatively to doe it, that then the congregation is free from their former ingadgement: But when the grounds of out thrusting are not so much somewhat the person, as somewhat in the common cause, and when the congregation can have none in his place, but ane opposit wolfe, and when it cannot be so much as rationally supponed the Ecclesiastick Judicatorie which put him in would have consented to his thrusting out, then certainly in this case the argument does strongly hold. This argument I confess does not reach all congregations, yet will not want its oun weight with these whom it concerns. The former arguments prove it unlawfull to submitt to the Prelats and Curats, although they had essentials of a Gospel office in the Church. This following argument makes against the very being of their office and so strikes at the root: But because possibly it will not relish even with some of these who are not practically, we shall therefore only prove it & press it as we can submitting it to the Judgment of the sober and Judicious.

Argum. XI. These who want the very essence, being and reality of ane office appointed by Christ in his house, for the conversion, salvation and edification of his people, off their hands the people of the Lord are not to take the ordinances of Christ, neither are they to doe

any thing that may be interpreted a ſubmiſſion unto them in the Lord, as unto the meſſengers of Chriſt, yea it is ſinful and unlawful ſo to doe: But the Prelats and their Curats are ſuch. Ther for the Lords people are not to take the ordinances off their hands, nor may doe any thing that may be interpreted a ſubmiſſion unto them &c. without a hainous ſin. The major none will denay, but Socinians and others the groſſeſt of hereticks and ſectaries, and is clear from *Rom.* 10: 15. How ſhall they preach except they be ſent, that is impoſſible (ſpeaking *de ſure*) would the Apoſtle ſay, ſo likewiſe *Matth.* 28: 19. *John* 20: 21. So that we need not inſiſt upon it, for thoſe who have not Chriſts miſſion or Commiſſion, or have had it, hes it recalled, are not to be looked upon as officers in the houſe of Chriſt: Neither can there be ane exception here drawen from our practiſe in hearing probationers or expectants, for they only exerciſe their gift in preaching, being licenſed ſo to doe by the Presbyterie. The *minor* is that which will be ſtuck at by many, & yet we ſhall eſſay to make it out, and to begin with the Prelats, we ſay, they want the very eſſence of a goſpell Church officer, authoriſed to teach, baptiſe &c for if they have it, they muſt either have it as Prelats, or as as they are Presbyters or miniſters, not as Prelats, for the office of Prelat is not of Chriſts inſtitution or permiſſion, as was preſuppoſed, neither have they it as Presbyters: for if they have eſſentialls of this power as Presbyters, then they muſt either be virtually Presbyters, or formally ſo, but Presbyters virtually they are not, for ane antichriſtian office in the Church cannot virtually contain in it a Chriſtian Goſpell office of Chriſts inſtitution, Prelats and Presbyters are not ſubalternat (as Prelatiſts would have them) but meer oppoſits, like heat and cold; but cold is not virtually heat, neither is heat virtually coldneſs: Neither is a Prelat formally a Presbyter firſt becauſe correlatives with a mutuall reſpect to one another

are not consistent in one and the same subject; being opposits, as is knowen, a man cannot be both a father and a son with a respect had to the selfe same person; but according to the Prelats principle, Prelats and Presbyters are correlatives; for a prelacy as such is to them a Lordship and Dominion over the office of a Presbyter, or a Presbyter as such; for Presbyters they say, are nothing but their servants and underlings, yea very substituts, which absurdity, their last & great Champion Doctor Hamond is forced to run into, from whence it followes that a Prelat is not formally a Presbyter, no not so much as to the essentials of the office, seing he cannot be both superior and inferior to himselfe, a Lord to himselfe & a vassal to himselfe: This argument stands good in the principles of Prelats, and we thinke Presbyterians. Should yeild them no more then their own principles will bear. II. Whe prove the minor thus: Those who are not to be looked upon as Christians or Brethren, but are to be looked upon as heathens and publicans, their Gospel call [hoc ipso] perishes, although they had it before; But the Prelats are not to be looked upon as Christians and Brethren, but are to be esteemed as publicans and heathens and therefor wants the essence of Gospell Church officers. The minor of this I prove first Becaus the Prelats are guiltie of horrid scandalous sins, as is clearly holden forth in the grounds of the forgoing arguments: and when they are told of these in privat by Christian people, they doe spurn at it and menaces, and least they should be delated to the Church, and the Church upon their obstinacy should proceed a formal casting of them out, they have overturned all the Church Judicatories. Now whether he that simply refuses to hear the Church, or he who not only disdains to hear the Church, but violently overturns it, deserves not to be esteemed as a heathen and publican, let any man Judge. Moreover the most of our Prelats did either at their admission to the Ministry, or since solemnly before God

God declare their approbation not only of the doctrine and worſhip, but alſo of the maner and diſcipline and Government of this Church with all the acts and conſtitutions of the Judicatories thereof, togeth er with their ſubmiſſion therto; in which it is determined that whoſoever takes upon him the office of a Prelat deſerves immediat excommunication; ſeing then they have approven their own excommunication, ſhould not we looke upon them as excommunicated; eſpecially ſeing their ſcandals are moſt groſs and moſt notorious, and ſeing (becauſe of their uſurping power) there is no formal acceſs unto them. The *minor* we prove III. thus: Thoſe who falls from that ſtation and office which they had in the viſible Church and Kingdome of Chriſt, and gets a ſtation or office in the Kingdome of Satan or Antichriſt, hes loſt the very eſſentialls of a Goſpel Church officer: But the Prelats are ſuch, the riſing is their falling out of the firmament of Chriſts viſible Kingdome, and now they are become at beſt, but Comets in Satans Kingdome of darkneſs, they are no longer ſtars in Chriſts right hand; Therefore they have not ſo much as the eſſence of a Goſpel Church officer. The *minor* of this well appear if we conſider firſt that the officers of the houſe of God of Chriſts inſtitution are by him ſett in the Church 1 Cor. 11: 28. are ſtarrs it Chriſts right hand Revel. 1. in which booke the Chriſtian Church is oftentymes compared to a world, in the firmament of which; for the inlightening and Government theirof Goſpel officers are ſett. Conſider II. that Revel. 9: 1. there is a ſtar falls from heaven, that is, out of the viſible Kingdome of Chriſt, it falls from heaven to earth, that is, from the ſtation and office he bare in the viſible Kingdome of Chriſt, unto a new office in Satans Antichriſtian Kingdome. For why? He gets the keye of the bottom-leſs pit [which is ſpoken in oppoſition to the keyes of the Kingdome of heaven given unto thoſe whom God hes ſett in his Church. Now let

any

any man Judge if these keyes be consistent together, especially considering that when he getts this new keye, he falls, as is said; it is true indeed that by that falling star is principally meant the Pope, but others are to be understood also, as first Popish Prelats, for their office differs not in kynd from the Popes their professed head and Master. II. Our Prelats; for albeit they doe not avow him to be their head, and profess a distance from him in some points of doctrine, yet their office, Government and discipline is the same to ane hairs breadth with that of Popery; that same political worldly Government and Antichristian Kingdome, unto which they have changed the Spiritual Government of Christ, as was shewed before. Now from what hes been said, it will be easie to make it out that the Curats or Prelats Ministers wants the very essentials of a Minister of Christ, and so are upon no terms to be acknowledged as his Ministers, which is the I I. part of the minor of the argument; for doing whereof we would sever these things which are necessary to the being of a Minister, from these which are necessary by divine precept or to the new being of it. Those which are necessarily by divinine precept, are the call of the people. holins inward & outward & literature; which thing cannot be wanting horrid sin and extream hasard. As for the two, The Curats hes them not. As for the 3. We hear not that there is much of it amongst the greatest part of them, houever we could wish they had more of it and grace to use it also; These which are necessary to the very being of a Gospel ministry, without which it is a very nullity, are gifts and mission or ordination: As for gifts (of which few of the Curats are guilty in any tolerable measure) although a man cannot be a Minister without them, yet a man may have them and not be a Minister. The only thing then to be insisted on is mission and ordination: Mission and ordination in the essence of it, abstracted from the Gospel rite of imposition of hands

hands and other circumſtances, is nothing elſe, but a miniſterial authoritative declaration of ſuch a perſon to be a Miniſter of Chriſt, he upon exact trial being found fitted and qualified and ſent of Chriſt as far as is diſcernable by man. Now who hes this miniſterial authoritative power? Not the Lord Prelat, not only becauſe he is a Lord, but alſo becauſe he hes no Church power, as is above ſhewed. For why This power is a part of the keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven, which are not given to the Prelat, he may, I confeſs, make open doores, and let them in upon the viſible Church to exerciſe what gifts he hes, and does as he pleaſes, but it is by a pick lock by the keye of the bottom-leſs pit; and this opening of the door *per fas & nephas* can never give to any man the authority requiſit to make him a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt; ſo that the Curats miniſtry is a plain nullity, and conſequently he is not to be acknowledged by the Lords People; This as it ſtrikes moſt directly againſt thoſe who hes their ordination from Prelats, ſo it hes its own weight alſo againſt others of them; eſpecially if we add thoſe things that are brought to prove the nullity of the power of the Prelat in whoſe hands they have reſigned up their former power, and ſo hes fallen from their former ſtations. Againſt the probation of the firſt part of the *minor* of this Argument,

It is Exepted firſt: That the office of a Prelat, in ſo far as it is Eccleſiaſtick [for they have civil power conferred on them and honour] is looked upon by ſome as the power of a Presbyter extended in the exerciſe thereof; and ſo not differing in kynd from the office of a Presbyter; and if ſo, it were hard to ſay, that becauſe Prelats uſurp that extended power at their own hand with the allowance of the Magiſtrat, that therefore *ipſo facto* they ceaſe to be Presbyters. *Anſw.* firſt: In the beginning of this diſcourſe we held forth the office of a Prelat to be eſſentially diſtinct from that of a Presbyter, to the inbringing of

of which there is nothing here brought but a bare assertion, and scarsely that. II. This power of theirs hes much in it of subjective intention, as it hes of objective extension; for it ingrosses in it the power of many Presbyters. III. Extend a Ministers power never so far, and widen his parish never so much; yet this never gives him a power or Lordship over other Ministers (which a Prelat claimes by vertue of his power Ecclesiastick, and not by vertue of the annexed baronnie or civil honour conferred on him by the Magistrat) nor makes them vassals and slaves, or at least so many cyphers; much less gives it him a power to usurp that in Ecclesiasticks which Christ hes reserved to himselfe, and hes committed to no Church officer whatsoever, which that our Prelats does, neither will the Magistrats allowance help the bussines here, so that this assertion is impertinent. IIII. it is easie for us to deceive our selves by imagining them to be some other thing then they are or will grant themselves to be; but that will never solve the bussines, nor satisfie the conscience.

It is Excepted II: That granting the office of a Prelat were deficient in kynd from that of a Presbyter, and so not of Christs institution, for which cause it is said to be antichristian, yet the assuming thereof being a greater power then Christ hes allowed in his Church, cannot make their lawful power as a Presbyter cease, untill by the Church they be deposed from Presbyters, for their usurpation & assuming the other unlawful power, so that at least whatever they doe which other Presbyters by vertue of their office might doe stands valid being done. *Answ.* we say that this office of theirs is purely antichristian, of that same nature for kind and quality with that of the pope; whereby he is formally constituted Antichrist; and if they nothwithstanding of this continue Presbyters, by that same Logick the pope continues a Presbyter yet, and so ane and the same man

hes

hes the keyes of the Kingdome of heaven hanging at the one ſide of his belt, and the keyes of the bottom-leſs pit at the other ſide; and that ſtar which is falling *Revel.* 9: *v.* 1. Is not fully fallen as yet.

It is Exceptd III. That that oppoſition between Prelat and Presbyter. as between heat and cold, is not ſo apparent, the Prelats not being antichriſtian. in a proper ſenſe; for Antichriſt diſclaimes them, and they him: It would rather appear that what oppoſition is between them, is the ſame that is between other ordinances as inſtituted by Chriſt, and the inventions of men ſuperadded therto, called alſo antichriſtian, becauſe beſide Chriſts inſtitution, or becauſe of Antichriſts invention; there is therfor no more reaſon that their aſſuming of that power, ſhould make them ceaſe to be Presbyters nor there is that the ſuperadding of the ſign of the croſs, ſhould make baptiſme ceaſe to be baptiſme. *Anſw.* Albeit the Prelats be not the great Antichriſt, yet they are limbs of him; and albeit they diſclaime him in word, yet their office and practiſe ownes him; and we fear their hearts too; the bairns fathers themſelves: the oppoſition therefore ſeems to be that which we aſſert, becauſe the one of theſe powers is inconſiſtent with the other, as hes been ſaid and proven; which probation this probable aſſertion does not make invalid. Any further anſwer requiſit here will be given in anſwering the main objection againſt this argument.

It is excepted IV. that their being groſly ſcandalous makes not their office to cauſe, nor doth anul their acts as Presbyters, as we may ſee in the examples of Hophni and Phinehas. *Anſw.* it is not only the groſsneſs of their ſcandals we ſpeak of, but the nature of them alſo; they being in their own nature everſive of, and incompatible with the Spiritual Kingdome of Chriſt, the like wherof cannot be ſaid of thoſe of Elies Sones; as is before holden forth.

Ex

Exception V. Prelats being first made Ministers: as is supponed, no act of their own with out the sentence of the Church interveening can exautorate them, unless it were such ane act as did unchristian them viz total Apostacie from Christian Religion, such as Prelacie is not; even as no act committed by a Church member can unchurch him without totall Apostacy, except we fall in with the Papists and Prelats, and maintaine excommunication *ipso facto*, which is condemned by our Orthodox divines (for which we are bidden see Didocl. pag. 399.) and the reason seems to be, because as the admission, so the degradation of Ministers is ane authoritative act of a Judicatory. Ans. I. it is true indeed that in a constitut Church standing unbroken, asther can be no admission without a Judicial sentence, so there can be no degradation either; but then, as in some cases 'a man may be a minister without any such sentence [as sound divines hold] why may there not be a case also in which they may be exautorate without any such sentence: and whether or not this present case be such a case is humbly proposed to your Judgement.

Answ. II. In a Church standing and unbroken we hold against the Papists and Prelats that there can be no excommunication, ipso facto, or without a Judicial sentence; but whether or not that or the equivalent of it in a broken condition of the Church, particularly in the present circumstantiat case that is proposed to yowto Judge of, neither will this fall in with the opinion of Papist and Prelats; for they hold excommunication ipso facto, in several cases in a constitut and broken Church, as is to be seen in Didocl. in the forecited place. *Answ.* III. there is a great difference here between a Church member and a Church officer, betwixt one Church officer & moe, between Church officers who purposedly breakes the Judicatorie and others. *Answ.* IV. Those called Gentiles *Revel.* 11:2. were Christians before & professed Christianity at the very tyme related to there; and so were not

to

totall Apostats; but who I pray did excommunicat them, or by what sentence? And to say that they were Gentiles Jure, and Christians facto, will scarsely agree with the series of these Prophecies, or with what Protestant Divines writes concerning the mixture of the Romish Church.

Exception VI. *Obect.* Two officers opposit and inconsistent can not be in one and the same person, if so be both of them be all officers, and the one of them not a nullity *in foro Dei*, as the office of Prelat is, and therefore a Presbyter his pretending to it, cannot enervate his office of Presbyter, which he hath *Jure Divino, nam non entis nulla sunt accidentia*. *Answ.* The Prelats which were Presbyters before does not only pretend to the office of Prelacy, but also does actually and really usurp it, and exerce it. Secondly, Ane office may have all that is physical or metaphysical in ane office, albeit it want that which is of divine institution, and all moral goodness, and so it may be *ens* and have it *accidentia*, as it really hes it acts, albeit the validity of these acts be questioned.

Exception VII. *Obect.* It will follow from this Argument, that no ordinance whether of Baptisme or ordination could be conveyed to us by the Romish Church, contrare to our Protestant divines. *Answ.* There is nothing here contrare to the Protestant doctrine; for Protestants hold, that before the beginning of the Reformation, those within the Romish Church were not all alike; many did not owne that Romish harlot; many who some way did owne her, did not owne her *abominationes*; some who did owne some of them, were far from owning all the consequences which now are cleared to follow upon them; and none, will deny but that the Church of Rome is another thing now, nor it was before *Luther* began the Reformation; the Lords People being now come out of her, and those within her now being made formally to owne her abomina-

tions: but more of this anone, much more might be added hereanent the validity of the call of our first Reformers, which we may not insist upon.

Object. Against the probation of the second part of the *Minor*, it is excepted: That although it may be granted that ordination by the sole authority of a Prelat ordaining, cannot be lawful ordination; yet that which is by Prelat and Presbyters is lawful, at lest being done is a valid ordination, & such are the ordinations that are now. *Ans.* We deny that the ordination nou are by Presbyters with the Prelats first from matter of fact, because sometime the Prelat imposes hands himself alone. Secondly, Because the office of these who at any time they admit to impose hands with them is already proven null. Thirdly, Because imposition of hands [in which only they concur] is only ane adjunct of ordination, & belongs not to the essence of it. Fourthly because the Prelat claimes unto himselfe the whole power and authority of ordaining, as may be seen in the edicts, albeit there were no other to evidence it, and therefore those admitted by the Prelat to impose hands with him, are but so many cyphers, having no power eyther of trial, voicing or passing the sentence, wherein [being pronounced publickly] the commission doth consist.

Against the whole of XI. *Argument* it may be objected thus: That if the Prelats and Curats want the very essentials of a Gospel office in Church, then it will follow first that all their acts are invalid, and consequently to be done over again. II. This will unchurch this present Church. III. It will follow that not only the Churches in those nationes under the Prelats were no Churches, but also that the Church of Rome before our separation from it, was no Church; all which are absurd, and therefore the premisses from which they flow must needs be absurd also. *Answ.* First, That which is constitutive of the visible Church entitative, being the profession of Scripture truths, which also is the only

ly essential note thereof, the want of true Gospel Officers (whom our present Church wants not, albeit the external liberty of the exercise of their gifts and offices be taken from them) or the intrusion of these who want the very essentials, can never destroy the present Church amongst us, so long as they hold to that profession. II. The Church of Rome before our separation from it had alwayes some in it, both Officers and People who never did receive the marks of the Beast, his name or the number of his name; the like we say of the Churches of these Lands in the tyme of the former Prelats, in which there were a number alwayes protesting against that antichristian Tyranny, who at length prevailed so far as to get it wholly cast off and solemnly ingadged against. III. The best way of shunning these absurdities in so far as they follow, is not to acknowledge these pretended Church Officers, nor to take ordinances off their hands, it will not be necessary to reiterate any of their acts. But IV. For a full and more clear answer to what is objected here consider first: That as it is difficult to find out wherein the essence of a morall entity or being doth consist; And the reason is, because each of these are made up of several physical or natural things and actions coexistent together and in a relation to one another, the adding or detracting one of which may sometimes overturn the very essence of such a morall entity, and sometimes not; and of this sort are all these things here in question.

Consider II. That it will be all one here to inquire what is essential in these things, and to inquire what is valid in law, or in the outward court of the Church; for as in deeds of law, the adding or omitting of some things, will only make that a fault, but will not make the deed invalid, other things again, the adding or omitting of them will make the act or deed altogether invalid, even so will it be with the things here in question: For in the ministration of Baptisme for example, there

may be ſome things the adding or wanting whereof will make the action ſinful only; other things there may be that will make it not only ſinful, but alſo altogether invalid. Conſider thirdly, That albeit all the acts and ordinances adminiſtrated by the Prelats and Curats are alike queſtionable here, as to their validitie; yet peoples mynds uſes not to be ſo much perplexed about theſe acts which ought and may be reiterated. We ſhall therefore only ſpeak to theſe which may not be reiterated, & theſe are only ordination and Baptiſme. But before we come to ſpeak to the validity of for giving light unto them, we will ſpeak a word concerning the reality of a *Church entitive* and *Organical*. Concerning which (ſupponing that the profeſſion of goſpel truths according as they are revealed in Scripture, is that which is formally conſtitutive of a viſible Church *entitive*) Conſider IV. That a viſible Church entitive may be in a fourfold caſe and condition. *Firſt* we may looke on it as profeſſing and owning all goſpell truths and no other, the whole Covenant of grace as holden forth in Scripture, and walking in practiſe and in ſome meaſure thereunto; and this is not only a true Church, but alſo a pure Church. II. We may looke on a Church as wholly apoſtatiſed, and fallen from the profeſſion of theſe truths, even the moſt ſubſtantiall of them; which is the caſe not only of Churches that may turn heathen or Mahumetan, but alſo of the Church of the Jewes at this day; who, as they reject the whole new Teſtament, ſo albeit they profeſs the Doctrine of the old Teſtament, yet they hold it only according to the Letter therof; and not according to the mynd of the Spirit of God; and of this ſtamp we apprehend many in the popiſh Church this day will be found; and ſuch a Church as this is, is neither a pure nor a true Church. III. We may conſider a Church as holding all the moſt ſubſtantiall truths of Chriſtianity, and preſerving of them pure, but with all erring in ſome things leſs ſubſtantial

ſtantial or more circumſtantial; and ſuch a Church as this is, though a true Church, yet is not a pure Church IV. we may conſider a Church as holding all the truths of God revealed in Scripture, as to the Letter of them, and yet perverting all, or moſt, even to the ſubſtantials of them, and that by alterations, additions, falſe gloſſes and the like; and of this ſtamp was the Church of Rome when we did ſeparat from it, for albeit they kept ſome of the fundamentals pure, ſuch as the Doctrine of the Trinity; yet the body of the Chriſtian Doctrine for the moſt part (and that even in fundamentals, which comes neareſt the heart of Chriſtianity) what by Traditions, what by Papal Decrees, falſe Gloſſes, was altogether perverted, and that not only as it founds acts of faith, but alſo as it appointes and preſcribes matters of Worſhip and government; a Church in ſuch a caſe may further be conſidered, either *abſolutely* in it ſelfe, or *relatively* in reſpect of God; and being taken abſolutely, we may conſider the body of the whole they profeſs and hold, either in bulk, for the Doctrines complex body of truth & errors imped together, by which errors theſe truths are wholly ſubverted, and in that ſenſe, ſuch a Church as that, is not ſo much as a true Church; for the profeſſion of that whole body of doctrines together cannot be formally conſtitutive of a true Church of Chriſt. Or, Secondly, We may conſider the body of theſe doctrines *inadequatly* or *partially* as they include the truths contained in Scripture; and then if the whole complex body of theſe doctrines be not rigorouſly impoſed, or if there be ſome who does owne only Scripture truths, or if they owne ſome of theſe errours, yet they are of the leſſer; or if they be of the greater ſort, yet they doe not either in opinion or practiſe owne any of theſe groſs conſequences that neceſſarily follow upon them: Then and in that caſe it may be ſaid, that there are ſome true members of the univerſal viſible Church of Chriſt there, albeit the

bulk and body of Professors cannot be truly called a Church of Christ. Next such a Church as this may be considered *relatively*, with a respect had to Christ the only King and Head of his Church; in which respect it may be considered, either as holding still the publick profession of that complex body of doctrines; or as already begun to cast off errours in opinion and practise, and to hold only to the truths contained in the Word of God. Under the former consideration such a Church is not a Church of Christ formally or actually, whether *jure* or *facto*, no more nor ane adulterous Woman who hes run away from her Husband, and is now of long time living with another man with whom she lyes in adultery, is not her former Husbands Wife; which appeares not only from the forementioned ground, but also from several places of Scripture see. *Hos.* 2. 2. But then albeit such a Church cannot be called a Church of Christ *formally* or *actually*, yet it may be called his Church *fundamentally*, so long as the foundation of the relation between Christ and them is not altogether taken away, which is not taken away without utter apostacy on the Parts of total rejection on Gods part, which is like that of formal divorce between married persones; for albeit a wife ly in harlotry never so long, yet the foundation of the relation between her and her husband does alwayes stand, until such a tyme as a formal divorce be made between her and him; under the latter consideration, such a Church as this, upon the back of their renouncing of these false & heretical doctrines, and their imbraceing of scripture truths purely, allanerly; both in opinion and practise without any further, it does presently become a true visible Church of Christ, actually and formally such. And this is the difference between the members of a Church so hugely degenerat, and those who are converted from Paganisme: Those who are converted from Paganisme, are to be baptised; those who are reformed

out

out of ſuch a Church as this, are not to be baptiſed for altho their baptiſm before was no baptiſme, wanted the very eſſentials and had no validity in it, as being a ſeal of that complex body of doctrines, ſpoken of before; yet they renouncing the erroneous part, and adhering only to what is ſound, it returns to be true baptiſme, a valid deed, a ſeal of the Covenant of grace. From what hes been ſpoken concerning a *Church emitive*, it will be eaſie to paſs a determination on what remaines to be ſpoken to. And *firſt* then, as to what concerns a Church organical [by which we underſtand a miniſterial teaching, ruling Church, conſiſting of Church officers, with a power to adminiſtrat all the ordinances of God, we ſay *firſt* that ane organical Church, conſiſting of theſe officers whom Chriſt hes appointed entering upon their offices, teaching and ruling in the Church, after the maner that Chriſt hes preſcribed in his word; are not only a true, but alſo a pure organical viſible Church of Chriſt. II. theſe Church officers who have degenerat in Jewish, heathen, mahumetan Preiſts or ſuch like, they are in no ſenſe to be eſteemed a miniſterial Church of Chriſt. III. theſe Church officers who as to their power and office, way of having and exerciſe thereof are ſound in the main, but yet hes ſome leſs ſubſtantial defects or exceſſes therein, theſe I ſay are a true miniſterial, teaching and Governing Church of Chriſt, although not altogether pure. IV. theſe Church officers who have offices that are not of Chriſts inſtitution, and uſurps a power over the Church and ordinances, partly worldly and political, partly proper and peculiar to Chriſt himſelfe, the only King and head of the Church; therefore; as inherent unto them purely Antichriſtian, ſuch officers, I ſay, although there be ſomething mixed in their offices and adminiſtrations which is of Divine inſtitution, yet they are not, neither are they to be acknowledged the teaching & governing Church of Chriſt. For why? That which saltered

and ſuperadded of diabolical and humane inventions; is deſtructive of, and does clearly overturn all that which is of divine inſtitution; hence it is; that ſo long as they adhere to all the complex parts of their pretended offices or power, and are adhered to in theſe, although but in practiſe, ſo long, we ſay, their offices and power is null, and conſequently all their acts are invalid; yet notwithſtanding their renowncing what is corrupt in their offices or power; or being renounced by theſe who have received ordinances off their hands, then & in that caſe, their acts may become valid; Baptiſme, for example; ſo as not to be reiterated; and ordination, ſo as to be the ground of ſentence of formal depoſition. Now this is the very caſe of this prelatical Church which is amongſt us. For why: It hes ſuch alterations and additions in it, which doth not only ſmother any thing of Chriſts inſtitution, pretended to be retained; but alſo does altogether corruptly overturn and change the nature of it; as hes been hinted at in ſeveral places before, and were eaſy to ſhew at full length if the nature of the government were our task at preſent

From what hes been ſaid here we deduce theſe conſequences, as a diſtinct and direct anſwer to the ſeverall parts of this Objection. *Conſequence firſt*: The *Church entitive* in this Land conſiſting of the body of profeſſing people is not unchurched by what is ſaid in proſecution of the argument. For why? the queſtion touches not them, only it touches the Church Organical, or the teaching and Governing Church. *Conſeq. II.* a Church profeſſing popery, and adhering in opinion and practiſe to the whole complex body of Doctrines profeſſed by the Church of Rome is formally and actually no Church at all in nothing to be communicated with, nor owned, except in order to the gaining of them from that way. *Conſeq. II.* This ſame Church renuncing their errors in doctrines and practiſe, is furthwith to be acknowledged

and

and may be joyned with a true Church of Christ. *Conseq IV.* Romish Church officers adhering to all the complex parts of that hierarchical Government are no wayes to be esteemed a teaching or governing Church, and all acts proceeding from them as such, are to be esteemed null and invalid. *Conseq. V.* The like is to be said of our Pretaticall Church officers of superior and inferior ranks, becauſe their government differs nothing from that of the Romish Church, but in ſo far as hes been ſpoken to in the beginning of this dicourſe. *Conseq. VI.* Church officers in a popish Church having been brought up in it, and having unwarrily ingadged to be office bearers therin, after that upon conviction they have renunced that hierarchical government, and all the antichriſtianiſme in it, and hes been inſtrumental in drawing off the Church from that way to imbrace the truth, they may be esteemed Goſpel Church officers of Chriſts inſtitution, and all the former acts may be esteemed valid, at leaſt to thoſe that goes along, with them in that renounciation. for why? that which was but fundamental before and neareſt to a nullity becomes now actual and formal. *Conseq.* VII. The like may be ſaid of theſe of the late Prelatick Churches of *Scotland* and *England* for the ſame reaſon, and much more of thoſe who did ſtill declare againſt Prelacy. *Conseq.* VIII. People adhering to a hierarchical Government, whether popish or meerly prelatical, and having had ordinances ſuch as baptiſme adminiſtred to them, theſe acts that were invalid before, becomes valid then, whether theſe hierarchical officers renounce their former way or not: The reaſon is, becauſe as their owning of and adhering (at leaſt in practiſe) to theſe things that made the power null and void did make the act invalid as to them; ſo their cordiall renouncing of theſe things, and your owning only a Goſpel Church office may make the act valid as to them. *Conseq* IX. The office bearers in a Church reformed in Government and diſcipline, as well as in doctrine wor-

ſhip, returning back to popery or prelacy; as their offices and acts are null and invalid, ſo long as they adhere to that way; ſo that albeit upon their renunceing again of that way (the people renuncing with them) their acts are to be eſteemed valid, and their office alſo in ſo far as to be the object of a formal ſentence of depoſition, which would have been paſt before if a true governing Church had been ſtanding) yet they are no more to be eſteemed office bearers in the Church of Chriſt, becauſe of their groſs apoſtacy and backſliding, which is to be underſtood mainly of theſe who hes been directly or indirectly active and inſtrumentall in carrieing on that courſe of apoſtacie; whoſe guilt as it is hainous in it ſelfe, ſo it is hugely aggravated by theſe following reaſones: *firſt*. Becauſe the evil of prelacy is now fully known and discovered. II. The difference that is betweene the ſpiritual Government of Chriſts houſe and the worldly politick and antichriſtian Government exerciſed by prelats, is fully ſtated. III. That ſame antichriſtian Government everſive of the viſible Kingdome and ſpiritual Government of Chriſt is fully and plainly imbraced & avowed by prelatical men. And that IV. upon the back of ſolemn ingadgements by Oath and vow to the contraire, taken on by the ſame men. So much briefly for ane anſwer to this objection. If there he any to whom this argument does not relish, let them paſs it; if they pleaſe and looke only to the forgoing argument, which we apprehend does ſufficiently evince the concluſion: Unto which we adde.

Argum. XII. That which cannot be gone about in faith, the doing of it muſt be ſinful and unlawful; but the hearing of the Prelats and the Curats, cannot be gone about in faith; Therefore it is and muſt be ſinful and unlawful. The *Major* is clear from Scripture. The *Minor* alſo from theſe two grounds firſt Becauſe [as we apprehend] no man ſeriouſly conſidering the matter can be fully perſwaded in his mynd of the lawfulneſs of the thing, and ſo at leaſt

, muſt goe about it doubtingly, which is a ſin be- God, even altho what he did were upon the matter ful *Rom.* 14: 5 23 much more then when the matter ogged with ſo much groſsneſs. II. we are to goe ut the uſe of the means of our ſalvation in the faith and ectation of Gods ſpecial bleſſing to goe along with own ordinances for the good of our ſouls; we are not y to be put to theſe duties from the word of precept, alſo the ſoul in going about them is to reaſon thus: eſe are the very ordinances of God, this man is ap- nted of God to carrie his mynd to me, and my deſire ack again to God, the Lord hes made promiſes of preſence and power in, and his bleſſing on his own dinances, and in the faith of that I will goe about my y: But how or with what conſcience can one reaſon s in hearing the Prelats or their Curats; his worſhip n muſt be mock worship, a very ſpiritleſs and ſouleſs orſhip; and what may God be provocked to doe to ſuch orſhipers?

Many moe arguments might here be induced for fur- r confirmation of this concluſion, not only from par- ular Scriptures, but alſo from the dreadful effects that oſeing, in with that way will have on the ſouls not on- of this generation; but more as to the following.

I. Bnt we ſhall adde no more, they that are brought, ing ſufficient.

It only now remaines that we endeavour to take out of e way theſe things that may be objected againſt our oncluſion, whether by Prelatiſts or others of whatſoever Jdgment.

It will be objected firſt: have ye not the doctrine pure, nd the worſhip unaltered, and may ye not diſpenſe then ith ſomething in Government. *Anſw.* we muſt not iſpenſe with any of the truths or ordinances of our Lord hriſt, but muſt contend for all the points of faith once delivered to the Saints, we muſt keep theſe things in- olbled to the coming of Chriſt, we muſt ſtand faſt to

the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, yea though ane angel from heaven should teach the contrary. II. Whatever Prelats and their brood thinke of Government; yet we thinke it the overturning therof. III, What assurance have we for the doctrine and worship. nothing but he said and she said, the passing words of false men; where is the Prelats Catechisme, confession of faith, or directory for worship to be found; and though they were to be found, yet what assurance could that yeild, seing they assume a power to shape and change invert and innovat as they please. IV. *Is* there not a standing law for the articles of Perth, conforme unto which is the present practise of many Prelatists. V. I grant they temporise now in many things, as to the outward way of worship, that they may the better hank and insnare the souls of the Lords people; but if there were a general submission we would see another face on affaires. *Ay but say they*, ye should not judge of mens intentions, but should take their professions. *Answ.* first whose profession should we take, that of false treacherous perjured men: II. are not the Lords people in all Christian Prudence to forsee hasards which concerns their immortal Souls, *Act* 20: 29, *Phil.* 3: 2. and wee beleeve, considering how false some men are, that their actings are a truer Judge of their intentions, then their professions are. VI. The Question is not whether or no we may hear, &c, our own lawful Ministers if they had the liberty of preaching, and were denyed the liberty of discipline and Government. But the question is, whether or no we may hear, &c, them who hes thrust out the Government of Christs Institution, and introduced one of a diabolical Invention and who takes upon them to shape and change all the ordinances of God which we have proven already to be unlawful.

Object. II. Will ye not obey the King and the Lawes. Will ye not be loyal? This is only the argument of the ignorant

morant countrey Curats, and informe it muſt turn thus: whatever King and Parliament commands and enacts, it is forthwith to be obeyed; But King and Parliament hes enacted obedience to Prelats and therefore they are to be obeyed. The *Minor* cannot well be denyed. As to the *Major* I ſay that truly I can be hardly perſwaded as yet to thinke that the Kings pleaſure is *prima Regula fidei & morum*, the firſt rule of Faith and maners, no not ſo much as in ceremonials of Religion; for if ſo, the ſchoolmen hes been very dull and short ſighted theſe many ages bygone, ſeing never any of them ſo much as reſted upon that opinion. Neither can I ſee any ground to aſſert that he is ane infallible interpreter of ſcripture, and ane unerring Judge of controverſies Eccleſiaſtick ſitting in *Cathedra Parliamentaria* in the chair of State, albeit I know the people claimes this. II. What if King and Parliament ſhould command going to Maſs the nixt year; the III. year the embraceing of Machumets Alcoran. Shall we furthwith yeild obedience. Ephraim for a tyme was oppreſſed and broken in Judgment, becauſe he willingly walked after the commandment. Hoſ. 5: 11. III. Some are of the Judgment, that in ſome caſes it is better to obey God nor man, and that in ſome caſes paſſive obedience or ſubmiſſion is all that the Magiſtrat can well expect but this is a dangerous argument, and therefore we will medle no further with it.

Obj. III. Separation from the Church is a pernicious and ſinfull evil; But your practiſe in not hearing, &c is a ſeparation from the Church. Therefore &c. *Anſw.* firſt. To the *major*, every ſepartion is not unlawful, but ſometimes a duty; witnes ſeparation from the Church of Rome. II. Corruption in the eſſentials either in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, or Government, is thought a good ground of ſeparation, at leaſt in ſo far III. Locall ſeceſſion may happen where there is not ſeparation from the Church. IV. ſeparation from a particular corrupt

rupt Church is not a ſeparation from Chriſts univerſal Church. V. There may be ſeparation from the corruptions of a particular Church, and yet not a total ſeparation from that ſame Church, VI. The Lords people may be beat from their duty; and driven into a wilderneſs condition by violent Antichriſtian Spirits; in which caſe they cannot be eſteemed Separatiſts from the Church. The *Major* then being taken univerſally and without limitation is falſe; and being taken particularly, the argument is not concludent, but conſiſting of pure particulars. As to the *Minor firſt* we ask who it is hes made the Separation? Not we, for we ſtand where we were, holding faſt theſe truths that we are convinced of by the word of God, unto the maintainance of which we are ſworn and obleidged by our ſolemn Covenants, under which the whole Nation ſtands yet faſt bound; ſome of our ſelves, we confeſs, have turned Apoſtats, taken on them Antichriſtian Titles, broken our Church to pieces, thruſt out our Miniſters and depryved us of pure ordinances, and what through fear and what through force, it hes carried a great party with them; But let any impartial perſon Judge, whether the Apoſtats ſhould be accounted Schismaticks and Separatiſts, or we who reſolves in the Lords ſtrength never to ſtep one ſtep nearer Rome, but in ſo far as we have already attained, to walk by the ſame Rule, and never to doe any thing that may make us pertakers of their ſins, and ſo Sharers of their Judgments, when the Lord comes to reckon. And though poſſibly we be the feweſt number, yet let it be conſidered whether Elias and the 7000. in Iſrael who bowed not the knee unto Baal, or the body of the Land were to be accounted the Separatiſts. We deny then the *Minor* of the argument; and though it were that our abſtinence did inferre ſeparation, yet it will not be found, that our ſeparation would be ſinful; but rather a matter of duty; as will be clear by applying what is ſpoken; in limiting the *Major* to the *Minor* in the argument, and the compareing

of

of both with the grounds of the argument inforcing the conclusion, But as that is obvious in it selfe, so we need not stay upon it; seing we are meerly passive, and not at all active in separation.

It will be instanced here: That although we be not active in separation, yet it is not enough; for we ought actually to joyn in the present publick worship; Because where there is a true Church, Christian people ought the joine with it: But here is a true Church; Therefore &c. The *minor* is proven, because in this prelatick Church, the true word of God is preached and professed, which is the essential note of a true Church. *Answ.* I. to the *major*; let it be granted, there is a true *Church entitive* here, yet we deny there is a true *Church Organical*; for the organs their of *viz* Prelats and their Curats are Anticristian, as hes been shewed; hence we may joine in privat fellowship with the Prelat, let it be true; we may joine in publick worship with their officers as such, by takeing ordinances off their hands, it is false. II. where is a true Church that is impure, christian people if they can get a purer Church they are to joyne in worship with that, and not with the other; If they cannot get a purer Church (I distinguish;) they ought to joyn; if they can doe it without sin, but if they connot doe it without sin, they must abstain. But that the Prelats and the Curats cannot be submitted unto, or joyned with, without sin, is proven by the whole arguments inforcing the conclusion; for that our standing aloofe is not for any thing in the people, but what is in the pretended officers. To the *minor* with its probation we say, that the pure word of God professed is indeed the essential note of the Church visible entitive, professores if they hold any error, as for example, concerning the spiritual Government of Christ, in so far that Church is defective, if not null, if it be in fundamentals. II. But to make up the essential note of the Churh organical, there is required also the preaching of the word; preaching

ching [I say] which is not only materially, but also formally essentially such, which cannot be but by preachers of Christs own sending; for every speaking of of the word of God is not the Gospel ordinance of preaching, neither is every one that speaks sent and authorised of Christ; see *Rom.* 10: 14 15. But the Prelats Curats and their preaching are not of the Gospel stamp, their Church therefore wants the essential note; therefore the Lords people ought not to joine actively with them.

Object. IV. A wilful depriving our selves of the word of God must be a sinful thing; But our not submitting to the Prelats and Curats is a wilful depriving our selves of the ordinances; Therefore a sinful thing. the *minor* is proven, because we must either take the ordinances off their hand, or have none at all. *Answ.* the major we grant. As for the *minor*, it is not only false, but a lewd lie; for albeit we cannot submitt to the Prelats and their Curats without horrid sin; yet it is weel knowen we would willingly submitt to the pure ordinances of Jesus Christ and wait on them for our souls good. As to the probation of the *minor*. that we cannot have the ordinances but by the Prelats and their Curats, we confess it is our sad affliction; but it is not our sin, let them count for it who is the cause of it, the judgement of God we leave them unto: In the mean tyme we desire to looke higher then the Prelats in this matter, resolving to bear the indignation of the Lord, because we have sinned against him, until he plead our cause &c. And we hope that our standing aloofe from them if We be diligent in privat duties, may be a readier mean of bringing about that, nor our sinful joyning with them can be.

Object V. That which tends to make the whole countrey Atheists by casting them loose must be very sinful; But your not submitting to the Prelats, &c. tends toward that; Therefore it must be very sinful. *Answ.* I. That which *per se* or of its own nature tends to the turning

ing

g of people atheists is sinful. I grant; that which nds only by accident that way, I deny. But that ur not hearing, &c. Does of it selfe tend to make eople atheists, I deny as false: by meer accident it ay be true, and therefore that our abstaining is sin- l it will not follow, the reason of this is, because y hearing would be (as is allready proven) sinful nd therefore my abstaining from sin, and cleaving to y duty, cannot have any influence of its own nature pon anothers committing of sin, I confess through eir ignorance and corruption, it might prove scandal, only taken, but it could never prove a ven scandal. II. That which most immediatly and its own nature tends to the turning of people ath eists the depriving them of the pure ordinances of Jesus hrist, and clubing them unto a course of apostacy, as r us, we must not sin in joyning with a course of apo- acie, though all the world should turn atheists, we nst not doe evil that good may come of it (and truly e see not what good would come of it] we have not learned Christ. III. we know nothing that tends so uch to the turning of people atheists, and to makeing em thinke, that all religion is but fancies, and a eer stirrop for wealth and worldly greatness, as for en to preach and presone thing one year, yea and swear to it, and press others to doe the same; and e nixt year, over the belly of oaths and honesty, for se and worldly ends, violently to urge the plain con- ire. IV. We appeal to the experiences of all con- ientious men, if ever atheism and ignorance of God d more abound in any place of the world, then in the aces where Prelatists bear sway; so that to joyne in a ourse of submission unto them, were to joyne in the tablishment of atheism on the earth. V. We hope at the very want of publick ordinances may contribute ore to the keeping of these in a tender frame of spirit, ho conscientously refuses to joine with the Prelatists,

nor the hearing of the dead and irreligious Prelatists could doe, the countrey proverb hes something in it; better loose then in ane ill tethering.

Object. But their grand Argument is from *Matth.* 23. which, as with a piece of greater ordinance, they thinke its ane easie businesse to batter down all the bulwarks of their adverse party; it may be in forme thus: It was the duty of the People of the Jewes to hear Scribes and Pharisees, and to submit unto them. Then it is our duty to hear the Prelatists and submit unto them. But the first appears from *Matth.* 23; *v.* 1. 2. 3. Therefore, &c. The connexion of this hypothetick *major*, they will confirm thus; because it hath been greater sin (if a sin) to hear Scribes and Pharisees, nor it is to hear Prelatists; because forsooth our Prelats and their Curats are not so bad as Scribes and Pharisees were; and it is not probable that Christ would command to hear Scribes and Pharisees, and not allow us to hear Prelats and Curats and submit unto them. This is their Argument in the best forme, and with the greatest strength that I can thinke it can have.

Answ. We shall first discusse the antecedent of the *major* assumed in the *minor* proposition with the confirmation thereof. As to the *minor*, then *first*, We would consider what thir Scribes and Pharisees were. Secondly, What is meant by *Moses* chair. Thirdly, What is imported in their sitting therein. Fourthly, What is meant by doing and observing what ever they bid them observe. As to the first of these, to begin with the Pharisees, they certainly were a sect, *Act.* 15: *v* 2. and 26: *v.* 5. much like one of these amongst the Papists, for example the Jesuites, (but what their tenets were is not my scope) and altho all the Pharisees were not of the tribe of *Levi*, yet many of them, especially those who were in publick office in the Church, were Priests and Levites, see *John* 1. *v* 19. and 24. compared; yea, this was a prevailing sect, and had infected the most of

these

these in publick office; hence we read of Priests, Levites, Rulers, Scribes and Pharisees, all of them Pharisees: See further, *John* 3: *v* 1. *Act.* 23: *v* 9. So that it will be all one to inquire here, what are Pharisees, with what are Scribes, as to any publick office; for they seem to coincide in the same persons. As for Scribes then, *Hebr. Se-pher*, that is, a Scribe, booke man, enarrator or explainer; it was a name of publick office, not of sect. In this place of publick office ecclesiastick, which Scribes were all of the tribe of *Levi*, Priests, *Ezra* 7: *v.* 5, 6. *Nehem.* 8. 1, 2. and *Levites*, 1 *Chron.* 24. 6. For the Levites were not only divided in Singers porters, officers, &c. but also in Scribes 1 *Chron.* 24: *v.* 23. the ablest for teaching by reason of gifts and education being designed for that imployment. The office of their Scribes was first publick teaching, *Ezra.* 7: *v.* 10. *Nehem.* 8 *Matth.* 7: *v.* 29. and 13. *v* 52. ane office competent in ordinary to the tribe of *Levi* as such, *Deut.* 33: *v.* 10. Secondly, They were members of, or Rulers in Ecclesiastick Judicatories, not only in the Synagogues or inferior Judicatories, but also in the Synedrim, or supream Ecclesiastick Judicatorie, being assumed into that because of their office or parts, *Luke* 22: *v.* 66. *Act.* 23: *v.* 9. Now thir Scribes and Pharisees being men in publick office of Gods appointment, in this far we may grant the *minor* of the argument. Furthermore in Scripture (which is considerable) there are some called Lawyers Doctors of the Law, whose office it seems (as is current among wryters of Jewish antiquites) was not to teach publickly, or in the Synagogue but privatly in schooles, which Lawyers, albeit there were Scribes and Pharisees too, no doubt; for which see *Matth.* 22: 34, 35. compared with *Mark.* 12. 21. yet all Scribes and Pharisees were not Lawyers, for which see *Luke* 4: 44, 45. but they were distinguished one from another by the distinction of the incloſed from the inclu-

dent; which seems to be the only way of reconciling together of these three forceited texts: Besides its probable, that some Pharisees who were not Scribes or Levites, might have been Lawyers, as to that part of the Law called Judicial, and so in a capacity and fitness to be assumed into civil Judicatories; viz. into the civil Synedrim supream when it was standing, or if it was now standing, and not rather taken away by Herod; however propable it seems, that the Scribes and Pharisees Spoken of here *Matth* 23:2. were only these Scribes and Pharisees that were Lawyers; for what is spoken of Scribes & Pharisees here, vers 4. is appropriated to Lawyers in a contradistinction to the rest of the Scribes & Pharisees *Luke* 11: 46. and if ye will diligently compare these two chapters, ye will find that what is charged promiscuously upon Scribes and Pharisees *Matth.* 23. not excluding but including Lawyers under them; the same things are all distributively charged upon Pharisees, Scribes and Lawyers *Luke* 11. and wes pronounced against every one of them distinctly for their own share of guilt. The II thing considerable is what is meant by *Moses chaire*? By chaire here is to be understood in a metonymy of speech, some publick office exercised in that chaire, what this puklick office was will appear after we have made a search into the the word *Moses*. The word Moses may either be taken properly or figuratively; figuratively we say by a metonymie of the instrumental cause for the effect; Moses, for the Law delyvered by the Ministry of Moses, see *Luke* 16: 29. the sense then will be, the office that thir Scribes and Pharisees brooked, wes ane office versant about Moses Law, partly viz in teaching the same, partly in sitting in Judicatories and giving out Canons, decrees and sentences of Judgment according to the same. But if any incline to take the word properly, which seems as probable, then it will be necessar to inquire, what office Moses had, and in what of

these

ese he could be succeeded by thir Scribes and Pharisees. *First* then, Moses was a Lawgiver, but in this he was not succeeded by Scribes and Pharisees; for no ordinar officers had power to deliver a new Law, to the Lords people, nor yet to adde any thing to that already delivered; albeit thir Pharisees were sinfully medling with that II. Moses was King, in Jesurun, but in that he was not succeeded by thir Scribes, &c. Neither did they claim unto it. III. Moses was ane extraordinar Priest, as in consecrating Aaron and his Sons; but in this in ane ordinary way, Aaron and his Sons and posterity did succeed him, not the Scribes and Pharisees as such. IV. Moses was a Prophet, ane expounder and applyer of his own Law, witnes his delyvery of the whole booke of Deuteronomy, and in this as in ane ordinary way he was succeeded by the whole tribe of Levi, so especially by Scribes who here were also Pharisees. V. Moses was a Judge in matters Ecclesiastick, in which he was succeeded by the synedrim Ecclesiastick, and other inferiour Judicatories, of all which Scribes and Pharisees were members as hes been showne. VI Moses wes a Judge in matters civil, in which he was succeeded by the suprem Synedrim civill and others of inferror rank Into all which, no doubt, many of the sect of the Pharisees were assumed for that skill in the Judicial Law that they were presumed to have. Thirdly by thir Scribes and Pharisees their sitting in this chaire of Moses is to be understood their actuall exercising of these offices which at present they did brooke. Where it is considerable, that the word rendered, [*sitt*] in the Original is not in the present, but in the by past indefinit tyme, and should be rendered, they have sitten, which phrase, as I conceive, hes three things in it. First thir Scribes of the sect of the Pharisees hes crept in piece and piece along while agoe into places of publick trust and imployment. II. They are now sitting and brooking their places with-

out control, tho moſt unworthy. III. They are not to ſitt long, Chriſt being within a few weeks by the Miniſtry of his Apoſtles to ſett up the Goſpel Churchin the place of that corrupt one of theirs; unto which therefore, while a ſhort time were over, he wold have no ſtirr made as to any change: As if Chriſt would ſay, they have ſitten, doe ſitt but ſhall nott ſitt long, being incorrigible, ſuch as will not ſubmitt to me and my Goſpel, and with all the curſed ſect of the Phariſees who for their corruptions in doctrine and practiſe are to be rooted up, and caſten over the hedge, as plants not of my heavenly fathers planting. *Matth.* 15: v 13. IV. it is to be conſidered, that theſe words, *whatſoever they bid yow doe*, that obſerve and doe, are not to be underſtood in that univerſality, but are to be limited by *Matth.* 16, 6. 12. For they were to tak no corrupt Doctrine off their hands, and theirfor ſeing the matter that people were bidden obſerve, muſt admitt a limitation, wherefore may not the maner of this obſervance admitt a limitation alſo. V. It is very obſervable that there is not a word in the text, of hearing, but only that they were to obſerve and doe what they did dictate and command by vertue of their office, which dictats and decrees might be thoſe of Lawyers, Scribes in their Schools, or as they were members of the ſeveral Judicatories, to the knowledge of which people might come by reading or otherwiſe; albeit they did not actually hear them or ſubmitt unto them, by countenancing of them; which certainly they might not doe, if their countenancing of them; wold have inferred ane approbation of their corruptions; and if this interpretation of this particle of the text hold, by vertue thereof we may deny the minor, and aſſert, that thir people were not oblidged to hear the Scribes and Phariſees, eſpecially ſeing the thing that Chriſt bids them obſerve and doe, might be ſuch doctrines, dictats and decrees which did anteced Chriſts ſo full a diſcovery of

their

their corruptions in this and the forgoing chapters: All which will yet be clearer, if we will take a short view of the sense of the place together in order to its scope (having always done it by parts) which may be holden furth thus: Christ having put out these Scribes and Pharisees in a publick disput and affronted them before the people, *Chap.* preceeding, and being about to discover very much of their corruption before the said people, and denounce many sad woes against them, and with all not having a mynd to alter any thing for that little time that was to interveen till after his ascension, neither having a mynd to reforme that fabrick of the Jewish Church at all, but to lay down a ground for removing it out of the way, in planting of his Gospel Church, by the ministry of the Apostles, upon the back of his sending down the gifts of the Holy Ghost; & because for present thir Scribes and Pharisees, were in place and power, had the truths and ordinances of God among their hands, lest in this mean time people should have casten at the truths of God, and being ready to reject them because of the horrid corruptions of those throughwhose hands they came: Christ in the entry here guards them against that, injoining that notwitstanding of whatsoever, was to be discovered in these men, yet they would be careful to observe and doe what soever was truth and duty, even tho taught and commanded by them, and not to cast at it upon that account; altho he was far from bidding them doe any thing that might be interpreted a countenancing of them, or joining with them, or approving of their corruptions. whether in doctrine or practise. Heaving thus discussed the antecedent or minor of the argument; We come nixt unto the *major*, the connexion where of we deny; As to the probation thereof we say first its false. Secondly, It is not full. As to the first, if ye will compare our Prelats and Prelatists with the Scribes and Pharisees, either as to the way of comeing at their places, or as to their principles, practises, Doctrines and the sad

effects that followes upon these, and redounds to the Church of God, it will be found, that in all these, the the one is as bad as the other; all which might be fully holden forth, if we did not here intend brevity; so that our Prelats are no less bad, but rather more bad then the Scribes and Pharisees, it is true our Prelats and Prelatists did never persecut Christ personally and crucifie him; but that would they have done if they had lived then & had the same temptations. And however doe they not persecut and crucifie him in his members. And what is the difference then? Its true likewise Christ did never say out of his own mouth in so many words and syllabes, our Prelats and Prelatists have sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost; yet I thinke if ever any since the daves of these Pharisees, were guilty of that sin (of which I doe not doubt) that some at lest of this present gang (all thing being considered) will be found to be the men: But I doe not stay on this. Secondly. This their confirmation of the *major* is not full; for there may be many other differences between one party and another, besides that of personal goodness and badness, whereupon Christian People may lawfully joyne with and submit unto the one, and not at all unto the other. We shall therefore here in the close hold forth some of these differences, by which the bottome will altogether be beaten out of this objection and the Prelatists fully frighted away from this their supposed impregnable strong hold. *First*, Then thir Scribes and Pharisees, what ever corruptions were in their persones, doctrines and way, yet they had a lawful office, power and authority of Divine institution, which our Prelats have not; both which have been already holden forth and this is a very considerable difference; for as we may not in all cases submit unto those, who have the essentials of a lawful calling, *viz.* when the submitting unto them must needs be interpreted our approbation of their corruptions, and a joyning with them in their evil way,

and

and consequently sharers with them in their guilt; so we
must never acknowledge them to be messengers of
Christ either by word or deed who have no lawful
office at all what I say of Prelats here, the like I say of
Prelats, Curats, according to *Argument* XI. Its true
indeed the Curats pretend to ane office that is really of
Christs institution; on the contrare, the office that the
Prelats pretend unto, is not of Christs institution, yea
is expresly discharged in his word, and here is a great
odds, I confess. But the question remains yet, How came
they by this office. Who made the office to their persones.
Or how came they by that office again, if once they did
forfault it, certainly they could not take it to themsel-
ves *Hebr.* 5. 4, 5. Neither could the Prelat that anti-
christian officer make this application, as is proven
above: Hence altho the office of the Ministry be a reall
lawful Gospel office, yet a Curat is no more a Gospel
Minister, whether as to circumstantials, nor a pursevant
a real Pursevant who only pretends a commission
from the Lord Lyon, but hes it not, tho in the mean
time the office of pursevancy be a real lawful office. If the
Scribes and Pharisees whatever corrupt courses they
tooke to win at these places they held, yet generally
they were admitted and assumed to the places by those
who had power so to doe; but our Prelats and their Cu-
rats come into their places over the bellie, and without
the consent, assumption or admission of any what soever
that hes power, whether Pastors or People. III.
The corruptions wherewithal the Scribes and Pharisees
were infected, did creep insensibly bit and bit, and
that in a long tract of tyme, without the discerning of
beholders. But the corruptions of our Prelats and
Prelatists, come in altogether, and to the discerning
of every beholder, and must be swallowed doun in
lump; so that they who submitt sunto them, needs not
say, that they were stollen off their feet before they ad-
verted, as thir people of the Jewes might have said, in

reference to the Scribes and Phariſees, inſenſibly infected with the leaven of falſe doctrine, Hypocriſy and other corrutions of theſe perſons. IV. The corruptions of the Scribes and Phariſees when Chriſt pronounced theſe words *Matth.* 23: 2, 3. were not diſcovered; for altho Chriſt had made a right full diſcovery of them in his Sermon, yet that diſcovery was not made to all, but to a few and even thoſe to whom the diſcovery wes made, very few underſtood Chriſts meaning; for its knowen, that even Chriſts diſciples after his reſurrection, were ſtill doting after a worldly Political Kingdome and Government of Chriſt, like that of Antichriſt now, and like that of our Prelats, their ignorance of which is ane evidence of their ignorance of other things which Chriſt taught. Neither was the doctrine which Chriſt taught in oppoſition to the corruptions of the Scribes and Phariſees at that tyme received, embraced and profeſſed, at leaſt by any conſiderable number, or in any publick maner or way: But the corruptions which are in our Prelats and Prelatiſts have been fully diſcovered to all, and to the conviction of all; ſo that even the Prelats themſelves, nor none of their gang dare bring matters vnto a publick rational debate; and the contrary doctrine hes been received, imbraced and profeſſed by all, as the truth of God, and that publickly by perſones of all ranks, yea even by theſe who now hes apoſtatiſed; from whence it appeares, that albeit it had been lawful to have heard the Scribes and Phariſees, yet it would not be lawful to doe the like in reference to Prelatiſts. V. Theſe words *Matth.* 23. 2, 3. were pronounced in a declyning ſtate of the Jewiſh Church, then matters were ſtill waxing worſe and worſe, and defection growing to a full height, ſo that matters yet had never taken a turn; but the commands to ſubmitt unto the Prelats and their Curats comes out of the back of a Reformation of the ſame corruptions and abuſes. VI. The corruptions in the Scribes and

Phariſees

Phatiſees were never ſworn but upon conviction of the ſinfulneſs of them; but the corruptions of our Prelats and Prelatiſts have been ſworn out of this Church and ſolemnly covenanted againſt, and upon clear convictions of the ſinfulneſs of them, and of their deſtructiveneſs to all the intereſts of Chriſts Kingdome, and of the ruine they brought to the ſouls of his people, ſo that the oath of God is on us never to buckel with them. VII. The corruptions of the Scribes and Phariſees were in a Church which Chriſt had not a mynd to reforme [at leiſt as to corruptions only] but to deſert ane make ſeceſſion from and that within a few weeks, by ſetting up his own Goſpel Church, and to leave theſe corrupt men altogether to the Judgment of God, which within fourty yeares wes cruelly execut upon them by the ſword of *Titus Veſpaſian*. But the corruptions of our Prelats and Prelatiſts are in a Church which by Gods appointment is to continue in that ſame frame to the end of the world without alteration, either in ſubſtantials or circumſtantials, and which every one in their place and ſtation is bound and oblidged to keep pure. VIII. The corruptions of the Scribes and Phariſees were to be caſten out, being now of a long tyme ſettled; but the corruptions of our Prelats and Prelatiſts are to be received in: Now there is a great difference between theſe two, any man may perceive; for in caſting corruptions out of a Church, there may be ſuſpenſion for a little tyme upon providential conſiderations: *Præcepta affirmativa*, we ſay, *obligant ſemper, ſed non ad ſemper*; and in the litle interim while a full diſcovery be made, things may ſtand in their former poſture. But it is far otherwiſe as to the inbringing of corruptions, we muſt not give place here for a moment, the precepts diſchargeing us in this caſe are negative; binding us not only *ſemper*, but alſo *ad ſemper*. IX. Supponing it was lawfull at that tyme to hear the Scribes and Phariſees [which I ſpeak not to hear] yet if any

did

did ſcruple to doe ſo, their hearing of them would not have been a ſupervenient ſcandal; for as matters ſtood then ſetled, no man could have ſtumbled at their ſo doing; but as matters ſtand now circumſtantiat with us, tho it were otherwiſe lawful in ſome caſes to hear thir Prelats and their Curats, yet it could not be done without greivous ſcandal, as who ever underſtands the nature of ſcandal and conſiders the forgoing differences, will eaſily diſcern. Now from thoſe differences it does clearly appear, that altho it had been lawful to hear Scribes and Phariſees, yet it will not follow that it is lawful for us in any caſe, to hear the Prelats and their Curats. or to ſubmitt unto them, without horrid ſin and ſcandal, and a pertakeing with them in their apoſtacy: yea granting [which we ſhall not deny] that every precept of our Lord Chriſt to his Church is binding to it, in all after generatians; yet a precept of this nature will not bind, but in the like circumſtantiat caſe Now what difference there is between the caſe of our Church and that of the Jewiſh Church, about the tyme of Chriſts ſuffering, hes been already ſhowen. Neither ſhall I deny but that this precept might have had its own uſe, and have been obleidging, as to ſeveral things, when the Goſpel Church began firſt to looke out of popery, and had not yet wreſtled out of the harlots clawes, and pure Goſpel ordinances not as yet ſett up; but that caſe was not like our caſe, but moſt like that of Jewiſh Church. We have been longer in our inquiry in this queſtion, then we intended when we began, having alwayes diſcovered greater abominations the further we ſearched into it; juſt like thoſe who rakes into a vile ſink or pudle, albeit in the brim nothing but ordinary filth appeares, and afterwards a noyſome ſtink ariſes, yet the ſnakes and toads are not discovered till they come at the bottome. We ſhall now then, having made this diſcovery, propone only this queſtion for a concluſion of this diſcourſe, that

ſeing

seing there is so much ill in this way, Wherefore is it that so many, of whom in charity better things might have been expected, joines with them in practicall complyance? The reasons whereof we apprehend to be these. *First* rooted atheisme, ignorance and regardlesness of God. II. Stupidity of conscience and untenderness of heart. III. Ignorance of the Gospel way appointed by Christ as King of his Church, for makeing the fruits of his Priestly office forthcoming for the good of souls, that is, by his oun officers and ordinances, according to his precise appointment IV. Loathsome indifferencie and lukewarmness in the matters of God. V. Real regardlesness of their own souls. VI. Faithless and carnal fear of men more then of God. VII. Worldly myndedness, preferring the profites, pleasures and honoures of this world above all things; some for fear of losing these things, and some in hope of gaining them, swallowing greater bones then this VIII. Giving way to the falsness and deceit of the heart in coyning distinctions and putting colours upon things which will not sustain before God, neither satisfie ane awakened conscience. IX. a prepostterous esteem of men in former ages tho in some things might have erred, in some things mistaken by us (for circumstances varieing, the case varies) following them *sicco pede*, never inquireing further into truth, thinking it enough that they thought and practised so. X The power where by ministers exercise their office not being much under debate these yeares bygone, and the derivation there of not being discernable and obvious to the understanding, as the gifts and personal qualifications, of Ministers are, some well meaning people look only at the gifts and personall qualifications never so much as inquires into the power & authority to exercise these gifts XI. Untenderness in the use of Gospel ordinances then we had them in purity, power & plenty; folks frequent-ing them with common hearts, acted only with custome and drawen with a sort of carnal

nal reſpect to things or perſones, tho ſpiritual not ſeing ſpiritual comelineſs in the ordinances of life, nor conſidering that they [we mean theſe of Chriſts appointment only] are the channels and conduits were through life giving and ſaving grace is conveyed unto ſouls, and that he hes tryſted his ſpecial gracious preſence in them, not being acted by divine command nor yet praying unto, and leaning upon the Lord in frequenting them, for his promiſed bleſſing upon his own ordinances, nor thirſting for Chriſt and his fulneſs exhibited in them in a word not endeavouring to worſhip and adore the Lord in ſpirit and in truth, with all the heart in every piece of his appointed worſhip. What wonder is it then that ſuch folk prove untender now, yea and for their former abuſe of mercies, be deſerted and given up of God, to ſuffer themſelves to be deluded, and made to eſteem theſe things to be the ordinances of God, that are nothing but the empty ſhadowes of them, real husks without any more. It were uſeful therefore for folks to repent for bygone ſins, to pray for Gods direction, to pry morenarrowly into the evil of theſe things, to beware to party men in their ſins in ane unlawful practiſe [although commanded] which hes ſuch dreadful evils involved in it, and to remember the vowes and ingadgements that are upon them to the contrary; for if we turn back again after all theſe vowes, and with the dog lick up our vomite again, what will the end be? It had been better for them not to have knowen the way of righteouſneſs, nor after they have knowen it, to depart from the holy commandement given unto them. 2 *Pet.* 2:21.

FINIS.